

THE CHRISTIAN REFORMER.

No. CXXX.]

OCTOBER, 1855.

[Vol. XI.

THOUGHTS ON SECULAR ATHEISM.

CHAPTER I.

THE ATHEISM AND (SO-CALLED) SECULARISM OF THE PRESENT DAY.

THE old controversies of one age become new in another, and are as fresh and engrossing to the new minds engaged upon them, as if they had never before been made subjects of debate among men. And this is perfectly natural, because each generation, if not every individual in it, has its own thinking to do for its own mental formation. We are accustomed, indeed, to speak of society as growing older, and of the acquisitions of one age as forming the starting-point for the next; but this is only true in a very general and vague sense, and it is true rather of the outward inventions and discoveries of men, than of their more abstract speculations and opinions on mental and spiritual subjects. Even material inventions have occasionally been lost and have re-appeared as new ones; while the scientific knowledge connected with an invention has been altogether neglected by many who have acquired the practical art,—as at this moment there are multitudes of clerks employed in working the Electric Telegraph, who are utterly ignorant of the scientific principles on which it is constructed. Still more evanescent from the general mind of society are those arguments in intellectual philosophy and morals, in cosmogony and ontology, which, after they have been debated, and for a time settled, by the earnest minds of the day, leave no visible and tangible art behind them as their material result.

Then, this *mind of society*,—what is it, after all? Society has not properly one mind, but many. It is a vast aggregate of units, and each unit is a world of thought to itself. Every individual mind that really grows and developes as a human mind may do, must go over the same difficult fields of thought that millions of thinkers have trodden before; and though helped by the record of their thoughts, its own thinking is not superseded. And how often does it happen that a new thinker, or a new race of thinkers, enters upon the thorny maze of abstract inquiry, without possessing the clue which former thinkers have left! A new age, or a different country, and especially a different class of society, may be profoundly ignorant of all that has been

thought by men of ancient times, cast by them perhaps into a national form of thought, and written in a foreign, perhaps now dead, language. And thus it may happen that some men of this day and this country, revolving the everlasting problems which the world offers to their perplexed minds, as it has done to every age before them, may believe themselves to be the discoverers of truths as old as Moses, or the originators of doubts as old as the earliest Greek philosophy. They may re-state as new—what are indeed new to them—problems which fill the old world's literature; giving *original* solutions, which are indeed original to their own minds, but not to the mind of History, or denying the possibility of their solution with an absoluteness which scarcely accords with their own *dictum* of the uncertainty of all human convictions;—this *dictum* also being truly original to their minds, inasmuch as they are not versed in the writings of the world's earlier doubters.

The Atheistic controversy is as old as earnest and deep thinking; and it must be thought through and through again, by every active mind, and by every active age. As rekindled in this country at present, it has its peculiar and very important and interesting features; but the controversy itself can scarcely offer anything really new in thought or argument to those who know the history of philosophy. Without speculating upon the obscure ideas of ancient Egypt or India, the Greek philosophy has put upon record all the identical doubts and difficulties which have been since expressed in reference to the great problems of Creation and Providence, Matter and Mind, the Divine existence, and the condition and hopes of Man. The special aspect which the controversy now presents in Britain is, that it has become a *popular* question, a question eagerly and boldly taken up by “working men,” self-educated and self-reliant (if not self-confident too), among “the masses” of the people. With the Greeks, these profound questions were only debated among philosophers,—men of education and leisure. The people at large, clever and lively enough on other subjects, and apparently far above our “people” in power and cultivation of mind, were content with their grossly absurd mythology; and, like any modern bigots, were always ready to condemn suspected Atheists to death; among whom not a few of the purest Theists suffered. In the Atheistical period of the first French Revolution, these discussions had scarcely become interesting, as questions of metaphysical reasoning, to the popular mind, even in France, still less in England. The state of popular education was, in fact, so different from what it is now, that few of the manual-working classes were able, and not many even believed themselves able, to comprehend the very terms of such questions, still less to give judgment upon them. But now, there is far less self-distrust in attempting these subjects on the part of

self-educated men of conscious natural ability, than among men of large education and profound thought combined. It is indeed one of the inevitable results of the general diffusion of education, that questions high and deep like these will be ventured upon by a larger and larger order of minds. And it is a result that demands the earnest sympathy of the Theist and the Christian.

French popular Atheism arose out of French revolutionary feeling. The oppressions and miseries of the times were referred first to the Government as inflicting, and then to the Church as not preventing. Religion being chiefly known in its abuses and mummeries, and its priests almost uniformly addicting themselves to the anti-popular cause, to protest against religion was commonly deemed a part of the assertion of popular rights. This was the logic of French popular Atheism: "The Government oppresses us; the Church is in alliance with the oppressors; *therefore* there is no God." At the same time, the devout Theist felt his faith in the Divine government awfully tried by the near view and nearer endurance of his share in

"The wrong and outrage with which earth was filled."

Those were fearful days for religious faith; as are all times of sore evil, whether inflicted by man upon his fellow-man, or sent by the Power above. As men lived in the desperation of low self-indulgence from day to day when the plague raged in heathen Athens ages ago, and when it raged in Christian London not two centuries since, so political desperation spread the same kind of practical Atheism in France amid the horrors of her great Revolution. And then the theoretical rose up to vindicate the practical.

The Atheism of the old French Revolution took little root in England, though ecclesiastical as well as civil and social wrongs were freely canvassed. The great and ever-growing freedom of discussion prevailing in this country, was indeed our safety-valve against destructive explosion. But those who sympathized with French politics, had rarely much sympathy with French irreligion. It was chiefly known among us as having given occasion to Paley's Natural Theology and Priestley's Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever. English unbelief has been hitherto chiefly Deism, rarely Atheism. The men who have distinguished themselves in our national controversies against Revealed Religion, have been generally earnest advocates of Natural Religion, and many of their writings have breathed a high and pure spirit of piety as well as morality.

The more recent Pantheism, as it is called, of Germany, is far too subtle a thing to suit the masculine English style of thought. It makes Nature to be a self-developement of the Deity, and ourselves and all the lower animals, trees, plants and stones (as parts of that developement), to be parts of the All-deity; and, by thus making all things and all beings *God*, in a most unwor-

thy sense, obliterates the genuine idea of God. Thus speculative Pantheism becomes practical Atheism. All God is no God. All divine leaves no true Divinity. Most Theists, therefore, consider this system to be virtually identical with Atheism. It may have a few disciples possibly among mystical students; but it is not this order of thought or feeling from which the religious convictions of our countrymen are in danger.

The chief Atheistical tendencies of our age and country are, if we mistake not, the two following.

First, there is that which arises from the almost exclusive pursuit of *material* science by our scientific men. The mental and moral sciences are comparatively little studied; the physical, increasingly. It is easy to account for the preference generally given to the latter above the former, through their immediate connection with the various secular professions and pursuits of life. A man may *live* by them, but scarcely by the others. Discoveries in the one class may enrich him, but not in the other class; they can only give him repute among select readers and disciples. So the material sciences are chiefly pursued. And it is undoubtedly the tendency of an exclusive devotion to their pursuit, to make the mind indifferent, if not sceptical, as to the truths of purely intellectual and moral philosophy. A materialistic character of mind is contracted, which is unwilling to realize any ideas but those which represent outward objects and powers.

It is an old observation that medical men, and especially anatomists, are apt to be sceptical in religion. It really means, that they very commonly have some doubts respecting the nature of the human mind and its capability of separate existence after the death of the body, from which many religious people are exempt purely through their ignorance of anatomy and physiology. But an anatomist and physiologist who is not a mere material philosopher, may have a purer and sounder religious faith than that which is built upon scientific ignorance. Those, however, who have devoted themselves too exclusively to the mere mechanism and chemistry of the animal economy, may soon practically become materialists in their habits of thought, simply because their investigations have been limited to one order of phenomena. What they have not inquired into is, very unphilosophically, doubted by them. Their inquiries have been limited, and their conclusions are bold negations beyond the limits of their inquiries. They presume to say there are no other things than those dreamt of in their philosophy.

The same practical scepticism as to mental and moral subjects is found to result from the exclusive pursuit of any of the material sciences. A mere mechanist who can trace mechanical arrangements in the human frame, may persuade himself that man is nothing but a machine, because *he* knows nothing of the human constitution beyond its mechanism. A mere chemist may per-

haps persuade himself that chemistry is to solve all the mysteries of animal life and those deeper mysteries of consciousness and thought and affection, merely because he does not understand the philosophy of thought and feeling so far as it is ascertained, and in his ignorance of the more difficult parts of science, proudly exaggerates his own department, and fancies it applicable where it is quite irrelevant. All this is the mere self-exaggeration of one-sided study. It merely shews that the pursuit of material philosophy is more prevalent among us than that of mental and moral philosophy, and that the students of the former, not satisfied to confess their ignorance of the latter, sometimes presume to foreclose the inquiries specially appropriate to it. But if to the character of an accomplished physical philosopher be added that of mental and moral philosopher, the attainment of the former classes of science would come in aid of just conclusions in the latter. The powers of the mind must be investigated by means as appropriate to their nature as the experiments and inductions of material philosophy are to the discovery of the laws of matter. The laws of mind are not to be detected by mechanical or chemical induction, but by consciousness and thought supplying more subtle materials for more profound inductions. The enlargement of mind and grasp of thought and imagination which are promoted by the worthy pursuit of inquiries into phenomena so diversified and agencies so subtle as those of which the natural philosopher takes cognizance, should form a good preparation for the appreciation of things yet more subtle and quite diverse from all the rest. So truly harmonious are all the sciences. But though there is no real repugnance between material and mental philosophy, and the special pursuit of the one by one set of minds ought not to preclude or interfere with the conclusions of another set of minds specially devoted to the pursuit of the other; yet it must be acknowledged that an exclusive attention to the former does, as it were, *materialize* the habits of thought of many mere material philosophers, and tempt them to tacit, if not open, doubt as to the reality of mental or spiritual phenomena, as real as any phenomena of the physical world, but of which they are personally unobservant and incurious.

The physical philosopher, in whatever department, carefully observes phenomena and collects instances; and his immediate purpose is answered as soon as he can conclusively refer the observed phenomena to some great law of Nature, or group his instances in the order of Nature's admitted classes. And our physical philosophers too commonly decline carrying their inquiries further. The laws of Nature become, to them, ultimate causes. They think they have done their work when they have found the law. It is no part of their object to inquire into the origin of the law. They do not care to ask who is the Law-maker. As mere naturalists and physical philosophers, they may

be right; but as men devoted to the highest and most comprehensive philosophy, they are stopping short at the most important point of all. They are in the vestibule of the temple, but will not look in; they turn away and tell us they do not know whether there be a temple near. There may be prudential reasons, indeed (pity that it should be so!), in the state of the theological world, suggesting to them to rest content with thus tracing the material laws of the universe, and to leave all metaphysical and theological inquiries into the origin of those laws to other reasoners and teachers. But to stop there in self-distrust, is one thing; to be silent through dread of others' prejudices, is another thing; to deny that any one can go farther within the veil of causation, or to affirm that no cause exists beyond, is again a very different thing, and a very bold thing indeed. To say, I can go no farther than the laws of Nature—may possibly be, in some minds, the dictate of philosophical humility. But to say, or to imply, that the discovered law of Nature is the ultimate and self-sustained link in the great chain of causes, is the dogmatism of ignorance. To forbid all farther inquiry into the Intelligence which the existence of such a law seems, to most men's reason, to bespeak, is to ignore a law of the human mind as urgent as that which impels us to group phenomena in their classes and refer them to laws,—namely, that which demands a sufficient designing cause for certain orderly and beneficent effects.

Such is the negative or passive Atheism of exclusive material science. It is the practical un-reverence of those who can analyze a stone, but not a thought;—who, with extreme mental acuteness, can test by inferential experiment the reality of matter insensible to sight, touch, smell or hearing, but will not test the reality of thought by their own consciousness;—who can believe in matter so subtle as to elude the finest scrutiny of the senses, but are content to say they know nothing (or even, perhaps, believe nothing) of spirit making itself manifest in matter;—who can search patiently till they find a law, and from that moment rest quite satisfied, without inquiring how or by whom that law was devised and enacted and is continually enforced.

This materialistic habit of thought, long ago characterizing the minds of exclusive physical philosophers, has of later years gained ground among a wider circle of minds in the newly-educated and self-educated, and still but half-educated, classes of mechanical workmen. It is curious to notice the rash self-confidence of some of these rough thinkers, who have plunged into the depths of metaphysical and theological speculation, without even possessing an elementary acquaintance with the functions of the senses as vehicles of knowledge. We may hear such men—hard-headed men and clever men in their way—boldly declaring that they believe nothing but what their senses shew them; that what they see and hear, and touch and taste, is *real*; and

that nothing else is real. The soul, that some people tell them of, they would believe in if they saw it,—and Heaven, and God, in like manner! But nobody can shew them these things, so they will not believe such things are! On patient conversation with a man of this order, by making use of what little he knows of the construction of the eye, for instance, and leading him to realize the *mental* part of the phenomena of sight, he may presently be astonished to find how many things he has taken to be mere matters of direct sensation, which are truly matters of mental inference. He may be driven to confess, when put to the proof, that he does believe, and cannot avoid believing, many things in history and general knowledge, and many things in the daily commonplace of this life, on the testimony of other people, where his own senses have not access. He may presently be enabled to perceive that there is something not merely material in his own thoughts and arguments while discussing these very subjects; and may perhaps be made to feel that he is not wise enough yet, at any rate, to be the sceptical philosopher he professes himself. Such is, however, the crude Atheism of the selecter minds among the half-educated, who think themselves qualified to argue as metaphysicians by a very moderate acquaintance with the mechanical and other material laws of the universe.

But a wider and more potent source of professed Atheism among the manual-working classes, has been the misery and consequent political discontent of a few years ago. This is the second characteristic of the popular Atheism of our day.

The circumstances which gave this new birth to the Atheistic controversy in a fresh circle of society among us, seem curiously parallel (though at a wide interval) to the causes which excited it in France above half a century since. In both cases they were largely political. Comparing great discontents with small (yet the latter were not small in themselves, but only by comparison with still greater), the English popular Atheism arose with English Chartism, just as the French popular Atheism arose with French Revolutionary politics. Dear bread, long hours of work for little wages, or scarcity of work at any wages, were the frequently recurring lot of the working classes in Britain. Bad times suggested sore thoughts, by natural process. They referred these evils to the Government as their cause, and believed that "the Charter," with its five points, would be their sovereign remedy. Their leaders encouraged them to look with jealousy at all other classes of the community, as their enemies, if not their actual oppressors. To go to church on Sundays in a good coat, was felt as an insult to those whose wretched poverty forbade them to do the same if they wished. Religion was looked upon as an upper-class luxury. Its abuses were enlarged upon as constituting religion. The most absurd representations of its doctrines were quoted as its essence. Sunday became the great

agitation day. Each week's political action started from the Sunday's out-door meeting of hungry and miserable thousands. The reading of the working classes became altogether political. Their favourite lecturers left science and poetry, to talk politics. Their preachers became political lecturers, or were unlistened to. Their most popular religious periodicals dropped the Gospel for the Charter. The religious-hearted among the sturdy operatives of Britain looked at their starving wives and children, and said with despair, "Doth God know? Doth God regard?" And then hard-headed demagogues said to them, "There is no God."

The Corn Laws were abolished, but not one of the five points of the Charter was granted. Cheaper bread came, and unrestricted trade brought abundant employment and gradually increasing wages. These blessings have continued with greater evenness than ever was known in the memory of living men. The political excitement is all long since hushed. Not a whisper of the once all-engrossing, all-important, all-rectifying Charter is ever heard. Political agitation is dead of plethora. Good times have supplanted political nostrums. But religious feeling and conviction do not return as matter of course. The denial of a God is still matter of persevering reiteration and laboured argument among some of those whose faculties were quickened into political debate at first by the sharp spur of famine and distress. Such appears to be the special position of this great argument among us at present.

English Atheism has its periodical exponent, somewhat boastfully called "*The Reasoner*," a penny pamphlet seeking its way pointedly among the "masses,"—the conductor of which, G. J. Holyoake, is also known as a lecturer and debater on behalf of Atheistic principles before popular audiences in the large towns. He is, beyond doubt, a man of ability, and is reputed to be a man of good character; and, by many who do not hold his views, he is regarded as thoroughly sincere and earnest in his efforts to spread them. He stoutly advocates good morals, which he thinks are sufficiently enforced by a regard to temporal consequences, or better enforced thus than by the added motives of religion. His *Reasoner* is, however, open to some strong exceptions on the score of argumentative fairness, which shall be plainly stated. In attacking the doctrines of Theism, he delights to introduce into his pages the most absurd fancies of the most extreme Christian sects, as representative of the question at issue. He entertained his readers lately with reproducing a series of the most hideous wood-cuts from Father Piamonti's abominable little book, entitled, "Hell opened to Christians," which represent literal fiends, flames, bars, chains, nails driven through foreheads, demons gnawing men's hearts, and all such grossly imagined bodily tortures, in a way that is profanely burlesque even to an educated

Roman Catholic, and utterly abominable to every reasonable Protestant. Now this was quite unworthy of an intelligent and fair-minded man. To raise a laugh at ignorance and superstition, is no argument against philosophical religious convictions. It cannot have been done through ignorance on his part respecting the varieties of belief held by various classes of Christians; as Mr. Holyoake himself tells us that he occasionally attended a Unitarian chapel when a youth, beginning to doubt his parental Calvinism; and he must therefore be fully aware of the existence of a form of Christianity the most widely opposite to that which he has selected in order to throw ridicule upon religion.

His proper contest as an Atheist, indeed, lies not against Christianity at all, under any of its forms, but against simple Theism. If all Christians were ignorant fools, and Christianity beyond a doubt such as Father Piamonti chose to picture it, Theism would still be untouched by the exposure of Christian superstition. In all fairness, therefore, his contest against the religious belief of Christians should be directed not against any sectarian peculiarities (still less against individual extravagances), but against the broadest beliefs that are common to them all,—the doctrines of God and Immortal Life. To narrow the discussion to the special doctrines of sects or individuals, is but evading the real points at issue.

A very curious modification has also taken place in the style and title of the Reasoner himself. Mr. Holyoake will not be called Atheist any longer, but *Secularist* instead. Not that he has changed his principles, but that Secularist expresses Atheist more definitely! Now this change of name is full of significancy. It is a plain acknowledgment that the idea of Atheism is not acceptable to the minds of the working men in general, but, on the contrary, is repulsive to them. The avowed object of the change of name is, to use a *positive* instead of a negative description of the Atheist's position and views. But the term chosen is very far from doing this. It does not legitimately supply the positive side of that to which Atheism is the negative. Atheism means owning no God. Secularism means having an interest in the external and material life. Is all this secular world, then, the Atheist's own? Is not the Theist a secular person too? It is not true that Secularism is the distinctive quality or produce of Atheism. It is perfectly absurd to hint that the secular concerns of life have, or ought to have, no interest to the man who believes there is a God. Yet this is implied in taking the new name, *Secularist*, as equivalent to the old name, Atheist. Why, is not every man that lives,—is not the most religious man, the most spiritual Christian, that lives in bodily form and under bodily conditions, necessarily and rightly secular? What does secular mean? It means, etymologically, "belonging to the age;" say, to the *present* age. It is sometimes distinguished from

“clerical,” sometimes from “monastic,” but never, by those who speak good English, from “theistical.” Was there not, ages ago, such a combination of terms even as “secular clergy,” to denote clergymen who did not shut themselves up in monasteries? And is the established usage of the English language to be subverted now, in order to make *Secular* synonymous with *Atheistical*? It is a gross abuse of language. It is either giving up a respectable name to odium not properly its own, or it is clothing in the respectability of the term *Secular* the unloved idea of *Atheist*. And the latter is, no doubt, the object of the attempted change. But the Theist must not let go his secularity into such hands. He lives, equally with the *Atheist*, a secular existence; has, equally with him, secular wants to satisfy, secular duties to fulfil, and secular interests to pursue. If the distinction between them is, that the Theist has other views *also*, amid these and beyond them, while the *Atheist*’s views are limited to these, the assumption of the term *Secular* as descriptive of the latter, is not the legitimate mode of marking this distinction. A nomenclature is not a thing of little or no importance. A correct one helps clear thought and just sentiment; a confused one insures confusion of thought and feeling. If words are “the counters of wise men and the money of fools,” they should, for the sake of both classes, be stamped with their true representative value, that there may be no mistake among the intelligent, and no loss or damage to the simple. It is conceivable, indeed, that a man should (through some singularity or affectation of mind) choose to define white as the absence of all colour, and black as the combination of all the colours of the spectrum, and should write an optical treatise in this curious cipher; in which case, the intelligent reader who knew his whim and chose to humour it, could understand and assent to his demonstrations of optical science. But even such a reader would find it very troublesome perpetually to exchange his ideas of black and white when those common words occurred; and readers in general might be apt, ever and anon, to forget that, in this particular book, *black* meant what *white* does in all others, and *vice versâ*. To take such a liberty with language would be foolish, or deceptive, or both. So with the terms *secular* and *secularity*. They have an established meaning, which has been in perfect harmony with Theism as long as English has been a language. And though *Secularist* and *Secularism* may be new terminals, not found in the dictionaries, they can only be legitimately adopted with due regard to the analogy of other such terminals; and *Secularist* cannot therefore legitimately mean *Atheist*, but ought to denote one concerned with secular matters. I, then, a Theist and a Christian, am a secular man too. My secularity is no more inconsistent with my Christianity, than is my walking with my speaking. They are two attributes of one life, and quite harmonious. The Christian character is not

opposed to the secular, but includes and elevates it. I believe, as a religious man and a Christian, that my secular life is the great scene of my spiritual experience; and I repudiate with indignation the pretensions of a cheerless Atheism to claim as all its own this secular life in this goodly world, which to me is filled with the Divine Spirit and redolent of immortality. This secular world has a divine life in it which belongs not to the cloister; and, as a religious man and a Christian, I must endeavour to reclaim it from the touch of irreligion. The distinction is not the less false—though some religionists may have seemed by their occasional language to favour it—which would separate temporal things altogether from eternal things. The soul is reached through the senses, and heaven begins on earth to him who uses this world rightly. I, then, the Theist, am the true Secularist. My Secularism includes the perception of a Divine Providence over this life, and a human hope beyond. My *sæculum* is one of the *sæcula sæculorum*.

Protesting, then, against this mischievous abuse of language, we would still do justice to the position really assumed by our secular Atheists. By Secularism they tell us they mean to express, not the theoretical negation of Theism, but the practical results of the denial. They mean that they know nothing, believe nothing, hope nothing, care nothing, about any state of existence but the present; that they recognize no motives, desires, purposes, except those of the life in which they find themselves now existing; that they admit into their morality nothing but temporal considerations, having no reference to a Supreme Being as the Light of their intellect, or as Judge in the court of their conscience, or as Arbiter of the destinies of a life to come. This is the meaning they attach to the term Secularism. This is the practical side of their theoretical Atheism. These are the avowed positive results of their negative speculation.

In Mr. Holyoake's recent discussion with the Rev. Brewin Grant, the former laid down, as "the leading points with respect to Secularism which he undertook to explain," the three following:

"(1.) That attention to temporal things should take precedence of considerations relating to a [supposed] future existence.

"(2.) That science is the Providence of life, and that spiritual dependency in human affairs may be attended with material destruction.

"(3.) That there exist (independently of Scriptural Religion) guarantees of morality in human nature, in intelligence, and utility." (Public Discussion, Pref. p. v.)

As regards the first of these propositions, it is quite gratuitous to assume that any contrariety can exist between the rational and moderate use of temporal things and the preparation for a future existence. Their rational and religious use is the good man's most habitual preparation. The question of precedence

can only arise to the virtuous Theist just where Mr. Holyoake assures us it would arise also to the virtuous Atheist, namely, when the temporal things are gross, sensual, degrading, and when the alternative is to choose what is intellectual, moral and elevating to human nature. The Theist calls this giving precedence to the things of the soul above those of the senses; to the spirit above the flesh; to things eternal above things temporal, or temporary. The school of Atheism advocated by Mr. Holyoake, we rejoice to be informed (unlike all previous Atheistic schools), professes to make the same choice, though under different phraseology, and for motives which may seem to us inadequate to secure general obedience. As, then, in the Theist's and the Christian's mind, "considerations relating to a future existence" are such by reason of their being connected with the most elevated aspects of human life in the present state, the proposition "that attention to temporal things should take precedence of considerations relating to a future existence," has no distinct meaning, unless it be meant to imply that low, bodily enjoyments are to have precedence to intellectual and moral considerations,—a proposition which the writer himself would repudiate as a supposed doctrine of *his* Atheism, but which is strictly in accordance with Atheistic principles as generally expounded.

The second proposition is very oddly expressed, and hardly intelligible till explained by reading the debate held upon it. "That science is the Providence of life," turns out to mean, that the knowledge of the laws of Nature enables man to be a providence to himself; and this odd phraseology contains a great truth, which the Theist would express somehow thus,—that the knowledge of the laws of Nature enables man most successfully to pursue the means of good offered him by Providence. That science *teaches* the Providence of life, might be an intelligible proposition, implying neither the Theistic nor the Atheistic theory respecting the origin of those laws which it is the business of science to study. But that science *is* the Providence of life, is as absurd as to say that science *is* the formation of the universe, or that science *is* the guidance of the solar system, or that science *is* the growth of plants and animals,—because it tells us all that we know on these various subjects. "That spiritual dependency in human affairs may be attended with material destruction," appears to mean, when interpreted into plain English, that if a man, calling himself spiritual-minded, is absent-minded or abstracted, or is careless or disdainful of the known laws of the material world, he may, while spiritually musing, fall into bodily danger,—like the philosopher in the fable, in short, who, while intently star-gazing, fell into a ditch. Such is the second proposition, when clearly understood. It need not have been so disguised in its phraseology. Nor does it devolve upon the Atheist, or the Secularist, to prove the truth of the proposition.

Mr. Holyoake seems to have had chiefly in view that ignorant abuse of the doctrines of Providence and Prayer which leads pious men sometimes (but not often) to pray *instead* of working, when they might do both; as every intelligent Theist and Christian knows that the true use of prayer is not to supersede, but to sharpen and regulate, human effort, and that the true application of the doctrine of Providence is, to guarantee the stability of the motive in man by shewing him the stability of the Divine laws of Nature beyond himself.

As to the third point in the above enumeration, "That there exist (independently of Scriptural Religion) guarantees of morality in human nature, in intelligence and utility,"—it is obvious to remark, first of all, that the question is not correctly put, as lying between Atheism and *Scriptural* Religion. The real question at issue is between Atheism and Theism, whether the Theism of Natural Theology or that of Revelation. And the Theist, whether Natural Religionist or Christian, at once avows with gladness that there do exist guarantees of morality independent of scriptural religion. It is no characteristic of Atheism, or of Secularism, to maintain this. Clumsy as the phraseology is which says there are such guarantees "in human nature, in intelligence and utility," we suppose it means that the intelligence of man can find in the obvious utility of virtuous conduct, certain motives to morality without going to the Scriptures. Every Theist believes this, and sees in the fact thus adduced corresponding traces of Divine Providence in human life. The only question is, whether any *other* guarantees besides exist. To prove the existence of one class, does not disprove the existence of another. Mr. Holyoake believes the secular guarantees sufficient for the purposes of morality. And we rejoice to learn that he finds them (whether tacitly accompanied in his own mind or not by the religious sentiment which in argument he disowns) sufficient for his own moral guidance. But this does not prove that there are no other higher or purer motives to virtuous conduct, nor that there may not be more powerful ones. Religious fears may be more effectual with some coarse natures even than secular ones; and religious love prevailing in purer minds has far outgrown the guarantees of temporal utility. But Mr. Holyoake seems (in another book) even to arrogate for Atheism the exclusive praise of promoting morality; for he calls "the Atheistic theory" "that of pure moralism"! (*Philosophic Type of Religion*, p. 22.) This is rather too grasping. A while since we found the new Atheism claiming the whole "secular" world to itself; now it claims an exclusive interest in "pure moralism" (which we suppose means systematic morality). Nay, more: our Atheist can even set forth his own views as a "Religion"! "The Philosophic Type of Religion!" This is new phraseology, indeed, by which to describe Atheism. *Religion* has been always hitherto defined to mean,

the ideas men have of their relation to God, or the conduct which those ideas suggest. And Atheism has hitherto consistently scorned the idea of religion. But here it sets itself forth as religion in its philosophic type! This is very confusing phraseology. The philosophic type of an *Atheistical knowledge of God, or conduct in reference to God!* We cannot understand this. But we can understand Mr. Holyoake when he declares that he finds motives in the obvious considerations of temporal utility for the observance of morality to a certain extent. No religious man should overlook or affect to despise these considerations. They point directly from the constitution of human life to the moral argument for a God. But few persons will be apprehensive of virtuous motives becoming too influential by the further addition of a religious sanction in the thought of the Divine Character and Will, and in the belief that virtuous conduct will promote happiness not only in the life that now is, but also in a life to come.

Truly it is wonderful that any disputants, or any audience, could believe they were really occupied with the Atheistical controversy, while these three leading points were sustained by Mr. Holyoake, and seemingly disputed by Mr. Grant!

TENNYSON'S MAUD.*

WERE it not that some account of whatever may proceed from the pen of the Poet Laureate is justly due to our readers, we should have preferred to pass over the present volume in silence; for although it contains much which in conjunction with any name less eminent than his own would have rightfully demanded attention and admiration, it can add nothing to his reputation, even if it does not detract from it. Mr. Tennyson's previous triumphs have been so signal, and at the same time his efforts are so few and far between, that his readers are satisfied with none but the most splendid results. "The Princess" was published as long ago as 1847. "In Memoriam," which appeared to have been the work of many years, appeared in 1850. And while we have before been accustomed to account for the slender bulk of our poet's productions by attributing to him an over-fastidious labour of the file, and by supposing, as the history of his first efforts seemed to warrant, that he wrote much more than he finally thought fit to publish, there is about the principal poem in this volume a want of the elaborate finish and choice conciseness

* *Maud*, and other Poems. By Alfred Tennyson, D.C.L., Poet Laureate. London—Moxon. 1855.

which could alone justify our hypothesis. We had long entertained the hope that Mr. Tennyson was at last about to try his powers in a longer flight than he had yet attempted, and, leaving the ranks of the minor poets, in which, with Gray, he holds the first place, to assert and prove his claim to epic or dramatic fame. And if we regret that he has not done so, it is not from any disparagement of his previous poems in comparison with the statelier and more solemn beauties of heroic verse, but from a conviction that the latter offers the widest sphere of exercise for the noblest poetic powers, and that if the poet lessen his audience by the change of theme, he gains infinitely in the quality of his readers, and exercises a deeper and more ennobling influence.

Of the contents of the present volume, a part has already been made public. The death of the Duke of Wellington was commemorated by Mr. Tennyson, in his official capacity, in a poem which, in spite of the detraction which necessarily encountered a Laureate Ode, we thought, and still think, worthy of the occasion and of his own powers. And more recently, a short but very stirring poem, "The Charge of the Light Brigade," celebrating the desperate valour of Balaklava, appeared in the newspapers, and has now found parentage and a home in this volume. From the Ode, however well known it may already be, we cannot resist the temptation of making a few extracts. It displays in full perfection two of Mr. Tennyson's characteristic excellences—his metrical power, in which, we think, he is surpassed by few English poets; and his faculty of direct and stirring appeal to those human instincts of justice, honour, truth, patriotism and the like, which, however often invoked by the sounding phrase of poetasters, respond always to a manly utterance like this. The opening stanzas are solemn and impressive :

"Bury the Great Duke

With an empire's lamentation,

Let us bury the Great Duke

To the noise of the mourning of a mighty nation,

Mourning when their leaders fall,

Warriors carry the warrior's pall,

And sorrow darkens hamlet and hall.

Where shall we lay the man whom we deplore?

Here, in streaming London's central roar.

Let the sound of those he wrought for,

And the feet of those he fought for,

Echo round his bones for evermore.

Lead out the pageant: sad and slow,

As fits an universal woe,

Let the long long procession go,

And let the sorrowing crowd about it grow,

And let the mournful martial music blow;

The last great Englishman is low.

Mourn, for to us he seems the last,
 Remembering all his greatness in the Past.
 No more in soldier fashion will he greet
 With lifted hand the gazer in the street.
 O friends, our chief state-oracle is mute :
 Mourn for the man of long-enduring blood,
 The statesman-warrior, moderate, resolute,
 Whole in himself, a common good.
 Mourn for the man of amplest influence,
 Yet clearest of ambitious crime,
 Our greatest yet with least pretence,
 Great in council and great in war,
 Foremost captain of his time,
 Rich in saving common-sense,
 And, as the greatest only are,
 In his simplicity sublime.
 O good gray head which all men knew,
 O voice from which their omens all men drew,
 O iron nerve to true occasion true,
 O fall'n at length that tower of strength
 Which stood four-square to all the winds that blew !”

In the following passage, apt use is made of the fact that the bones of Nelson and Wellington find a common resting-place in St. Paul's :

“ Who is he that cometh, like an honour'd guest,
 With banner and with music, with soldier and with priest,
 With a nation weeping, and breaking on my rest ?
 Mighty seaman, this is he
 Was great by land as thou by sea.
 Thine island loves thee well, thou famous man,
 The greatest sailor since our world began.
 Now, to the roll of muffled drums,
 To thee the greatest soldier comes ;
 For this is he
 Was great by land as thou by sea ;
 His foes were thine ; he kept us free ;
 O give him welcome, this is he,
 Worthy of our gorgeous rites,
 And worthy to be laid by thee ;
 For this is England's greatest son,
 He that gain'd a hundred fights,
 Nor ever lost an English gun ;
 This is he that far away
 Against the myriads of Assaye
 Clash'd with his fiery few and won ;
 And underneath another sun,
 Warring on a later day,
 Round affrighted Lisbon drew
 The treble works, the vast designs
 Of his labour'd rampart-lines,
 Where he greatly stood at bay,

Whence he issued forth anew,
 And ever great and greater grew,
 Beating from the wasted vines
 Back to France her banded swarms,
 Back to France with countless blows,
 Till o'er the hills her eagles flew
 Past the Pyrenean pines,
 Follow'd up in valley and glen
 With blare of bugle, clamour of men,
 Roll of cannon and clash of arms,
 And England pouring on her foes.
 Such a war had such a close.
 Again their ravening eagle rose
 In anger, wheel'd on Europe-shadowing wings,
 And barking for the thrones of kings;
 Till one that sought but Duty's iron crown
 On that loud sabbath shook the spoiler down;
 A day of onsets of despair!
 Dash'd on every rocky square
 Their surging charges foam'd themselves away;
 Last, the Prussian trumpet blew;
 Thro' the long-tormented air
 Heaven flash'd a sudden jubilant ray,
 And down we swept and charged and overthrew.
 So great a soldier taught us there,
 What long-enduring hearts could do
 In that world's-earthquake, Waterloo!
 Mighty seaman, tender and true,
 And pure as he from taint of craven guile,
 O saviour of the silver-coasted isle,
 O shaker of the Baltic and the Nile,
 If aught of things that here befall
 Touch a spirit among things divine,
 If love of country move thee there at all,
 Be glad, because his bones are laid by thine!
 And thro' the centuries let a people's voice
 In full acclaim,
 A people's voice,
 The proof and echo of all human fame,
 A people's voice, when they rejoice
 At civic revel and pomp and game,
 Attest their great commander's claim
 With honour, honour, honour, honour to him,
 Eternal honour to his name."

How fine, and in how different a strain, is the strophe which follows immediately on the last extract!

"A people's voice! we are a people yet.
 Tho' all men else their nobler dreams forget
 Confused by brainless mobs and lawless Powers;
 Thank Him who isled us here, and roughly set
 His Saxon in blown seas and storming showers,

We have a voice, with which to pay the debt
 Of boundless love and reverence and regret
 To those great men who fought, and kept it ours.
 And keep it ours, O God, from brute control;
 O Statesmen, guard us, guard the eye, the soul
 Of Europe, keep our noble England whole,
 And save the one true seed of freedom sown
 Betwixt a people and their ancient throne,
 That sober freedom out of which there springs
 Our loyal passion for our temperate kings;
 For, saving that, ye help to save mankind
 Till public wrong be crumbled into dust,
 And drill the raw world for the march of mind,
 Till crowds at length be sane and crowns be just.
 But wink no more in slothful overtrust.
 Remember him who led your hosts;
 He bad you guard the sacred coasts.
 Your cannons moulder on the seaward wall;
 His voice is silent in your council-hall
 For ever; and whatever tempests lour
 For ever silent; even if they broke
 In thunder, silent; yet remember all
 He spoke among you, and the Man who spoke;
 Who never sold the truth to serve the hour,
 Nor palter'd with Eternal God for power;
 Who let the turbid streams of rumour flow
 Thro' either babbling world of high and low;
 Whose life was work, whose language rife
 With rugged maxims hewn from life;
 Who never spoke against a foe;
 Whose eighty winters freeze with one rebuke
 All great self-seekers trampling on the right:
 Truth-teller was our England's Alfred named;
 Truth-lover was our English Duke;
 Whatever record leap to light
 He never shall be shamed."

We turn somewhat unwillingly to "Maud." Our readers will easily imagine that the poem is somewhat fancifully and obscurely told, when they learn that the critics cannot agree whether it is a simple love story, or an allegory of the evils of peace and the purifying effects of war on the morality of a nation. Perhaps the latter opinion has suggested itself to the very acute reviewer who has made it public, and who evidently has peculiar powers of inspecting the interior of millstones, from the fact that the melancholy-mad young man, the unhappy lover of the poem, who tells his own tale, indulges in some very bitter rhapsodies on the morality of trade and the stagnating influences of peace, which are nevertheless quite external to the main plan and meaning of the whole. The nameless lover and poet is a youth, fatherless and motherless, who, up to the age of twenty-five, has lived alone, on a somewhat narrow income, somewhere where there are woods,

brooks, heaths and a sea-shore. His father had perished, when he was a child, by a fall from a rock; but whether the death was occasioned by murder, suicide or accident, no man knew. He had been unfortunate in some gigantic speculation, from which, nevertheless, the owner of the Hall had by had contrived to reap enormous profits. At the period at which the poem opens, the Hall, long uninhabited, is revisited by Maud and her brother, the children of its proprietor. Maud, now seventeen, in the first bloom of loveliness, had, years gone by, been the childish playmate of our misanthropic narrator, who resolves, however, at the very beginning, magnanimously to steel his heart against her beauty. And this is a prudent as well as a magnanimous resolution; for it appears that Maud is destined to be the wife of a neighbouring peer, who is also a millionaire. But of course the fate which pursues men and maidens in all poems and novels mischievously interposes. Maud and our poet meet, love, and plight their troth: a stolen interview, which the brother interrupts—reproaches—a blow—a duel—the brother's death—and eternal separation—are the natural consequences. And the poem ends with the very evident madness of the narrator, who nevertheless seems to recover, in the last stanza, sufficiently to take his love and madness with him to the Crimea.

The story is told in twenty-six short sections—we can hardly call them cantos—in which many varieties of metre and rhythm are alternately used. The following extract will give the reader a not unfavourable specimen of the whole:

“I have led her home, my love, my only friend.
 There is none like her, none.
 And never yet so warmly ran my blood
 And sweetly, on and on
 Calming itself to the long-wish'd-for end,
 Full to the banks, close on the promised good.
 None like her, none.
 Just now the dry-tongued laurels' pattering talk
 Seem'd her light foot along the garden walk,
 And shook my heart to think she comes once more;
 But even then I heard her close the door,
 The gates of Heaven are closed, and she is gone.
 There is none like her, none.
 Nor will be when our summers have deceased.
 O, art thou sighing for Lebanon
 In the long breeze that streams to thy delicious East,
 Sighing for Lebanon,
 Dark cedar, tho' thy limbs have here increased,
 Upon a pastoral slope as fair,
 And looking to the South, and fed
 With honey'd rain and delicate air,
 And haunted by the starry head
 Of her whose gentle will has changed my fate,

And made my life a perfumed altar-flame ;
 And over whom thy darkness must have spread
 With such delight as theirs of old, thy great
 Forefathers of the thornless garden, there
 Shadowing the snow-limb'd Eve from whom she came.

Here will I lie, while these long branches sway,
 And you fair stars that crown a happy day
 Go in and out as if at merry play,
 Who am no more so all forlorn,
 As when it seem'd far better to be born
 To labour and the mattock-harden'd hand,
 Than nursed at ease and brought to understand
 A sad astrology, the boundless plan
 That makes you tyrants in your iron skies,
 Innumerable, pitiless, passionless eyes,
 Cold fires, yet with power to burn and brand
 His nothingness into man.

But now shine on, and what care I,
 Who in this stormy gulf have found a pearl
 The countercharm of space and hollow sky,
 And do accept my madness, and would die
 To save from some slight shame one simple girl.

Would die ; for sullen-seeming Death may give
 More life to Love than is or ever was
 In our low world, where yet 'tis sweet to live.
 Let no one ask me how it came to pass ;
 It seems that I am happy, that to me
 A livelier emerald twinkles in the grass,
 A purer sapphire melts into the sea.

Not die ; but live a life of truest breath,
 And teach true life to fight with mortal wrongs.
 O, why should Love, like men in drinking-songs,
 Spice his fair banquet with the dust of death ?
 Make answer, Maud my bliss,
 Maud made my Maud by that long lover's kiss,
 Life of my life, wilt thou not answer this ?
 'The dusky strand of Death inwoven here
 With dear Love's tie, makes Love himself more dear.'

Is that enchanted moan only the swell
 Of the long waves that roll in yonder bay ?
 And hark the clock within, the silver knell
 Of twelve sweet hours that past in bridal white,
 And died to live, long as my pulses play ;
 But now by this my love has closed her sight
 And given false death her hand, and stol'n away
 To dreamful wastes where footless fancies dwell
 Among the fragments of the golden day.
 May nothing there her maiden grace affright !
 Dear heart, I feel with thee the drowsy spell.
 My bride to be, my evermore delight,
 My own heart's heart and ownest own, farewell.

It is but for a little space I go :
 And ye meanwhile far over moor and fell
 Beat to the noiseless music of the night !
 Has our whole earth gone nearer to the glow
 Of your soft splendours that you look so bright ?
 I have climb'd nearer out of lonely Hell.
 Beat, happy stars, timing with things below,
 Beat with my heart more blest than heart can tell,
 Blest, but for some dark undercurrent woe
 That seems to draw—but it shall not be so :
 Let all be well, be well."

The passages in which our poet alludes to the war are, in our judgment, neither poetically pleasing nor morally true. There has rarely been a controversy which has given rise on either side to more unreasonable statement or wilder theories, or in which it has been more difficult to maintain a firm position of impartiality, than this of war and peace. There has arisen a cant of war, and a cant of peace; and men loudly cry, on the one hand, that war is a necessary condition of civilized society, and the appointed regenerator of a people; while, on the other, they declaim, with an earnestness which smacks strongly of the commercial, not to say the selfish, spirit, on the inevitable sacrifice of life and property in the effort to vindicate justice among the nations. No few of us are forgetting that war can never be other than a necessary *evil*, even if it be accompanied by circumstances of compensation; and that the ideal of human society, as even the warlike nations of antiquity were able to perceive, is the safe development of arts, and letters, and science, and industry, under the auspices of reciprocal forbearance and eternal peace. And, again, there are some who need to be reminded that comfort, tranquillity, constant work, good wages—in one brief phrase, "food and raiment"—are not the only or the chief ends of life; nay, that there are considerations of right, of justice, of duty, which may imperatively demand the sacrifice of life itself.

We cannot consider the following passage, written in a measure which is by no means a happy innovation on old-fashioned English metres, to express anything better than the cant of war:

"Why do they prate of the blessings of Peace? we have made them a
 curse,
 Pickpockets, each hand lusting for all that is not its own;
 And lust of gain, in the spirit of Cain, is it better or worse
 Than the heart of the citizen hissing in war on his own hearthstone?
 But these are the days of advance, the works of the men of mind,
 When who but a fool would have faith in a tradesman's ware or his
 word?
 Is it peace or war? Civil war, as I think, and that of a kind
 The viler, as underhand, not openly bearing the sword.

Sooner or later I too may passively take the print
 Of the golden age—why not? I have neither hope nor trust;
 May make my heart as a millstone, set my face as a flint,
 Cheat and be cheated, and die: who knows? we are ashes and dust.

Peace sitting under her olive, and slurring the days gone by,
 When the poor are hovell'd and hustled together, each sex, like swine,
 When only the ledger lives, and when only not all men lie;
 Peace in her vineyard—yes!—but a company forges the wine.

And the vitriol madness flushes up in the ruffian's head,
 Till the filthy by-lane rings to the yell of the trampled wife,
 While chalk and alum and plaster are sold to the poor for bread,
 And the spirit of murder works in the very means of life.

And Sleep must lie down arm'd, for the villainous centre-bits
 Grind on the wakeful ear in the hush of the moonless nights,
 While another is cheating the sick of a few last gasps, as he sits
 To pestle a poison'd poison behind his crimson lights.

When a Mammonite mother kills her babe for a burial fee,
 And Timour-Mammon grins on a pile of children's bones,
 Is it peace or war? better, war! loud war by land and by sea,
 War with a thousand battles, and shaking a hundred thrones.

For I trust if an enemy's fleet came yonder round by the hill,
 And the rushing battle-bolt sang from the three-decker out of the
 foam,

That the smoothfaced snubnosed rogue would leap from his counter
 and till,

And strike, if he could, were it but with his cheating yardwand,
 home."

That the adulteration of food has proceeded to a frightful extent—that legislative interference has been required to put down outrages on women—that murders have been committed for the sake of the emolument from a burial club—is all too true; but what, in the name of logic, have these things to do with a thirty years' peace, or what proof is there that a thirty years' war would reform, or rather not render them infinitely worse? We thought it had been one of the evils which even warlike men acknowledged as attendant upon war, that it inevitably postponed the efforts of internal amelioration which, both on the part of the Legislature and society at large, have honourably distinguished the era of the peace. And in regard to the morality of trade, how is it to be mended by the example of army contractors, and commissariat departments, and official knavery? Is it not notorious that another necessary evil of war is shameless and unblushing jobbery? But we will quarrel with Mr. Tennyson no longer: we have need just now of all our patience for one another's extravagances of opinion. That a man like Mr. Bright should turn his unrivalled powers of eloquence against the cause of truth and right, is melancholy enough to witness so long as it lasts; but his course will leave but little impress upon the national policy and the

progress of the age. But when one who, like our poet, has deeply at heart the higher moral interests of England, and sees afar off how in this struggle is involved the life and death of European civilization, in which cause no sacrifice of wealth or even life could be too great, watches our *statesmen* falter at the post of duty, and fail to support even the clear demands of the popular conscience,—it is no wonder that he should break forth into lamentations as loud and as unreasonable as these. We will forgive Mr. Tennyson, for the sake of the provocation which Mr. Gladstone must have given him.

We will conclude this brief notice with what appears to us a charming poem. “The Daisy, written at Edinburgh,” is a title which hardly leads one to expect a vivid description of Lombard scenery. The metre, which we never remember to have met before, is constructed with true poetic art, and, at least in the hands of its originator, deserves to be repeated. Mark how the double termination of the third line prepares the ear for the anapaestic flow of the fourth. It is a pleasure to leave Mr. Tennyson with the hearty admiration which we can accord to this unpretending poem.

“O love, what hours were thine and mine,
 In lands of palm and southern pine;
 In lands of palm, of orange-blossom,
 Of olive, aloe, and maize and vine.
 What Roman strength Turbia show'd
 In ruin, by the mountain road;
 How like a gem, beneath, the city
 Of little Monaco, basking, glow'd.
 How richly down the rocky dell
 The torrent vineyard streaming fell
 To meet the sun and sunny waters,
 That only heaved with a summer swell.
 What slender campanili grew
 By bays, the peacock's neck in hue;
 Where, here and there, on sandy beaches
 A milky-bell'd amaryllis blew.
 How young Columbus seem'd to rove,
 Yet present in his natal grove,
 Now watching high on mountain cornice,
 And steering, now, from a purple cove,
 Now pacing mute by ocean's rim;
 Till, in a narrow street and dim,
 I stay'd the wheels at Cogoletto,
 And drank, and loyally drank to him.
 Nor knew we well what pleased us most,
 Not the clipt palm of which they boast;
 But distant colour, happy hamlet,
 A moulder'd citadel on the coast,

Or tower, or high hill-convent, seen
 A light amid its olives green;
 Or olive-hoary cape in ocean;
 Or rosy blossom in hot ravine,
 Where oleanders flush'd the bed
 Of silent torrents, gravel-spread;
 And, crossing, oft we saw the glisten
 Of ice, far off on a mountain head.

We loved that hall, tho' white and cold,
 Those niched shapes of noble mould,
 A princely people's awful princes,
 The grave, severe Genovese of old.

At Florence too what golden hours,
 In those long galleries, were ours;
 What drives about the fresh Cascinè,
 Or walks in Boboli's ducal bowers.

In bright vignettes, and each complete,
 Of tower or duomo, sunny-sweet,
 Or palace, how the city glitter'd,
 Thro' cypress avenues, at our feet.

But when we crost the Lombard plain
 Remember what a plague of rain;
 Of rain at Reggio, at Parma;
 At Lodi, rain, Piacenza, rain.

And stern and sad (so rare the smiles
 Of sunlight) look'd the Lombard piles;
 Porch-pillars on the lion resting,
 And sombre, old, colonnaded aisles.

O Milan, O the chanting quires,
 The giant windows' blazon'd fires,
 The height, the space, the gloom, the glory!
 A mount of marble, a hundred spires!

I climb'd the roofs at break of day;
 Sun-smitten Alps before me lay.

I stood among the silent statues,
 And statued pinnacles, mute as they.

How faintly-flush'd, how phantom-fair,
 Was Monte Rosa, hanging there

A thousand shadowy-pencill'd valleys
 And snowy dells in a golden air.

Remember how we came at last
 To Como; shower and storm and blast
 Had blown the lake beyond his limit,
 And all was flooded; and how we past

From Como, when the light was gray,
 And in my head, for half the day,
 The rich Virgilian rustic measure
 Of Lari Maxume, all the way,

Like ballad-burthen music, kept,
 As on The Lariano crept
 To that fair port below the castle
 Of Queen Theodolind, where we slept;
 Or hardly slept, but watch'd awake
 A cypress in the moonlight shake,
 The moonlight touching o'er a terrace
 One tall Agavè above the lake.
 What more? we took our last adieu,
 And up the snowy Splügen drew,
 But ere we reach'd the highest summit
 I pluck'd a daisy, I gave it you.
 It told of England then to me,
 And now it tells of Italy.
 O love, we two shall go no longer
 To lands of summer beyond the sea;
 So dear a life your arms enfold
 Whose crying is a cry for gold:
 Yet here to-night in this dark city,
 When ill and weary, alone and cold,
 I found, tho' crush'd to hard and dry,
 This nurseling of another sky
 Still in the little book you lent me,
 And where you tenderly laid it by:
 And I forgot the clouded Forth,
 The gloom that saddens Heaven and Earth,
 The bitter east, the misty summer
 And gray metropolis of the North.
 Perchance, to lull the throbs of pain,
 Perchance, to charm a vacant brain,
 Perchance, to dream you still beside me,
 My fancy fled to the South again."

BISHOP BATHURST.

THE Bishop is incomparable. He should *touch* for bigotry and absurdity! He is a kind of man who would do his duty in all situations at every hazard: in Spain he would have headed his diocese against the French; at Marseilles he would have struggled against the plague; in Flanders he would have been a Fénelon. He does honour to the times in which he lives, and more good to Christianity than all the sermons of his brethren would do, if they were to live a thousand years.—*Sydney Smith's Letters*.

REV. JOHN KENRICK'S PHœNICIA.*

THE chapter on the Alphabet, Language and Literature of the Phœnicians, although somewhat brief in its treatment of the subject, gives us a very interesting sketch of the progress of this branch of palæography, and shews clearly the close connection between the Phœnician language and the Hebrew. From the very commencement of literature, the Phœnicians have been acknowledged as the first nation who made use of alphabetical writing. The Greeks expressly tell us that they received their letters from them, and the statement is confirmed by the similarity of the names of most of the letters in the two alphabets, as well as by the great resemblance in form in several instances. Having reached the Phœnicians, however, we have no further evidence to guide us in our endeavour to trace the origin of alphabetical writing. Did they actually invent it, or not? Some authorities answer the question in the affirmative, but the evidence is scarcely decisive. Yet enough appears to shew us the very high antiquity of the art of writing by letters; the circumstance that we are unable to go further back for want of the necessary evidence proving that the commencement of the art is so remote as to be now altogether beyond our reach. On this part of the subject Mr. Kenrick gives us the following remark, from which it may be gathered that it is not so easy as is sometimes supposed to shew how the forms either of Phœnician or Hebrew letters originated from natural objects.

“Of the origin of this alphabet, the immemorial possession of the Semitic race, no opinion can be offered. If we are to seek for it in any extraneous source, we should naturally look to Egypt, in which as early as the building of the pyramids, visible form had been used as the representative of vocal sound. The phonetic use of hieroglyphics would naturally suggest to a practical people, such as the Phœnicians were, a simplification of the cumbrous system of the Egyptians, by dispensing altogether with the pictorial and symbolical use, and assigning one character to each sound, instead of the multitude of homophones which made the reading of the hieroglyphics so difficult; the residence of the ‘Phœnician Shepherds,’ the Hyksos, in Egypt might afford an opportunity for this adaptation, or it might be brought about by commercial intercourse. We cannot, however, trace such a resemblance between the earliest Phœnician alphabet known to us, and the phonetic characters of Egypt, as to give any certainty to this conclusion. The circumstance that the names of the letters in the Phœnician alphabet signify some natural object—*aleph*, an ox; *beth*, a house; *daleth*, a door; *gimel*, a camel, &c.—has led to the supposition that the figure of the object was assumed as the representative of the sound of the initial letter of the word by which it was denoted. Some few of the letters bear a slight resemblance to the objects whose names begin with the letter for

* Continued from p. 557.

which they stand, but this explanation cannot be carried through the alphabet without considerable exercise of the imagination. The letters which nearly resemble one another in sound, as He and Cheth, Zain and Tsade, Caph and Qoph, have been discriminated by slight additions or variations, whereas the objects which answer to them are widely different."—Pp. 163, 164.

The close affinity between the Phœnician and the Hebrew languages was well known to Jerome and others of the Fathers; and many words handed down to us by Greek and Latin writers as Phœnician or Punic, are found to be simply Hebrew,—e. g. the words Baal, Suffetes and others. The inscriptions on stones and coins which have been discovered within the last hundred years have further established and illustrated the fact. In most of those parts of the world with which the Phœnician race had communication, by commerce or otherwise, such monuments have been found. The intercourse between Phœnicia and Assyria is proved by the discovery of inscriptions of the former nation at Nineveh, "along with others in the cuneiform" character (p. 164). This last statement is a little vague, and might be taken to refer to *bilingual* inscriptions. If this be Mr. Kenrick's meaning, the fact stated would be of great importance in the deciphering of the cuneiform inscriptions, to which the accompanying Phœnician would most probably afford a key. We do not, however, remember any statement of Layard to this effect; the passage where he mentions these Phœnician inscriptions on Babylonian bricks not speaking of any accompanying cuneiform characters on the same brick. At least so we understand it. (Nineveh and Babylon, II. p. 532.) It appears, moreover, to have been found hitherto impracticable to decipher the Phœnician inscriptions in the cases now referred to.

Similar monuments of the presence of the Phœnicians have been also found in Egypt and at Athens, as well as in Malta and the other principal islands of the Mediterranean; in all of which the resemblance between the Phœnician and the old Hebrew writing character is plain, as well as the identity of the languages. Inscriptions and coins of the Punic branch have been discovered in the south of Spain and in the north of Africa, the French conquest of the latter region having, as might have been expected, greatly increased the number:

"The latest and most remarkable addition to this class is the tablet of Marseilles, which contains a tariff of the prices to be paid for various animals offered in sacrifice to Baal, set up by the authority of the Suffetes of Carthage in his temple at Marseilles. The Carthaginians had here a factory or commercial settlement, and carried on the worship of their tutelary gods, as the Phœnicians did at Athens, Memphis and elsewhere."—P. 160.

The account and translation of the Marseilles tablet given by Mr. Kenrick, and of the remarkable passage in the Poenulus of

Plautus, are highly curious and interesting both to the Hebrew student and to the general reader.

The chapter on the Religion of the Phœnicians forms a valuable contribution to the history of theology. It gives us a repulsive and lamentable picture of the religious condition of this ancient people. The contrast between them and their neighbours the Hebrews is most striking and instructive, bad as the latter undoubtedly were in some periods of their history. The cosmogony of the former, with some slight external resemblance to the Mosaic, appears to have differed from it in the great feature of being essentially Atheistic; while their theology and rites of worship were often gross, licentious and cruel in the extreme. Our space forbids us to dwell further on these particulars; but referring our readers to the work itself for Mr. Kenrick's very lucid and able statement, we must conclude this part of our notice with the following passage, the closing summary of the chapter:

“What we know of the religion of the Phœnicians is merely external, the names and attributes of their gods and the rites by which they were worshiped; to the more interesting question what spiritual conceptions were attached to these names and rites, or what moral influence religion exerted over the people, no answer can be given from any authentic source. Practical activity was the characteristic of the nation, and what foreigners remarked and recorded was the perfection of their arts and manufactures, and their aptitude in turning science to practical purposes. We find no trace of a belief in God as an intellectual principle distinct from matter; their speculative philosophy was Atheistic. The doctrine of a future life and retribution, which, in one form or another, is interwoven with the religious ideas of Egypt, appears to have been unknown to the Semitic nations. As a means of controlling the passions or softening the manners of the people, the public religion of Phœnicia was less efficacious than that of Egypt, whose priests, if they restrained the free exercise of individual powers, exercised a humanizing influence on society, and upheld law by the sanction of divine authority. Our ignorance of the religious system of Phœnicia is, however, the less to be regretted since it had little influence in historic times on the belief of other nations, or on the art and literature of the ancient world. Its genuine character was retained at Carthage, when it had been modified in the parent state by Grecian influence; and even after the fall of that colony, it long retained its hold upon the inhabitants of northern Africa who had been subject to the Carthaginian sway.”—Pp. 329, 330.

Mr. Kenrick, in his treatment of the History of Phœnicia, has divided it into four periods,—the first coming down to the wars with Assyria; the second, to the war with Babylonia; the third sketches its history under the Persians, and is followed by a chapter on the Siege of Tyre by Alexander; the fourth traces its fortunes under the Greeks and Romans, and during the middle ages.

Tyre, which, though of later foundation than Sidon, was virtually the capital of the Phœnician cities, consisted of two parts,

—one, on the mainland, called Old Tyre; the other on an island, a circumstance which gave it great advantages in resisting any hostile attack. Its strength, indeed, was such that it sustained three of the most memorable sieges in history. The first was that of insular Tyre, by Shalmaneser, King of Assyria, about 730 B.C.; it lasted five years, during which time the inhabitants, deprived of all supply of fresh water from the continent, depended only on the rain water they were able to collect in tanks. History does not inform us of the result of this siege, but the probability is that it was found hopeless and abandoned. In the interval between it and the second siege, the wealth and power of Tyre had rapidly recovered, and apparently greatly increased, for it now sustained an attack from the whole force of the Babylonian empire. It was in the prospect of this siege, by Nebuchadnezzar, that Ezekiel uttered the prophecy against Tyre, in which occurs the description of its commerce above referred to. The duration of this siege was enormous, surpassing even that of Troy, and may read a lesson to us impatient moderns who expect the strongest fortresses to fall in a few months. It lasted thirteen years, and appears, like the previous one, to have been without decisive result, beyond the destruction of the old city on the mainland.

After the capture of Babylon by Cyrus, the neighbouring nations of Western Asia were rapidly absorbed by the Persian power; and though Phœnicia seems to have maintained its independence during the lifetime of Cyrus, it made no resistance to his son Cambyses, who used its naval forces in his expedition to Egypt. The Phœnician navy from this time was an important instrument in spreading the dominion of Persia along the coasts of Asia Minor, and constituted the strength of the Persian naval armaments in the long struggle with Greece. It was its connection with the Persian empire which made Tyre the object of Alexander's attack in 333 B.C. Having driven Darius beyond the Euphrates, he proceeded along the coast of Syria, receiving the submission of the principal towns till he came to Tyre, which, though not refusing a nominal obedience, would not admit him to the island city. The complete possession of this being necessary to his security by sea and successful reduction of the maritime provinces of Persia, he prepared to besiege it.

This third and final siege was memorable for the pertinacity of both the attack and defence, and for the application of all the various resources that genius and indomitable energy could bring against desperate courage backed by wealth and persevering skill. In these respects, as in the union of naval and land operations, it bore a singular resemblance to the struggle for the far mightier stronghold whose fall has just resounded through the nations. Alexander's difficulties were enormous.

“When he resolved upon the siege, he had scarcely any fleet; while

the Tyrians had an ample navy, could reckon on aid from the fleets of Carthage, and the Persians were still masters of the sea. The walls surrounding the island rose to the height of 150 feet on the side opposite to the mainland, and were surmounted by battlements and towers. It was impossible to scale them, and the stones of which they were built were so large, and so firmly compacted together, that no breach could be made in them by machines worked from below, or from the unsteady surface of a ship. His only chance of success was the construction of a mole, by which his warlike engines might be planted on firm ground, and brought up to the level of the walls. The description which has been already given of the strait between the island and the continent will shew the difficulty of such a work. The interval was not much less than half a mile, and the sea rushed through the narrow channel with a strong current, often increased by the prevalent south-west wind."

By pressing into the service, however, the population of the neighbouring towns, the construction of this mole was proceeded with amidst difficulties both from the sea and from the besieged, which were met by indomitable perseverance and wonderful skill, so that at last the Macedonians were near enough to reach the walls with their projectiles. But they were also themselves exposed to those of the enemy, and the wooden towers erected on the end of the mole were destroyed by fire-ships towed close to them and kindled when the wind was favourable. The townsmen at the same time, manning their small boats, and protected by archers in their rear, set fire to all the machines which the fire-ships had left, and pulled up the stakes which formed the exterior face of the mole. The labour of the Macedonian army for many weeks was lost; a heavy sea accompanied the gale which had favoured the conflagration, and, penetrating into the loosened work, carried the whole into deep water.

But difficulties were to Alexander only things to be overcome. He forthwith commenced a new mole in an oblique and less exposed direction; and while it was being constructed, went himself to Sidon, which had submitted to him, to collect a fleet, for he saw that all his efforts would be useless so long as the Tyrians could command the sea. Besides the Sidonian fleet, his rapid energy, aided by the imperfect information possessed by his opponents, obtained for him also those of Aradus and Byblus, whose commanders, aware of the submission of their respective cities, but not of his repulse before Tyre, deserted the Persian cause. These ships, eighty in number, were joined by others from Asia Minor; and not long after, the Cyprians, having heard only of Darius's defeat at Issus, and Alexander's occupation of Phœnicia, brought over a hundred and twenty more. After a rapid excursion against the hostile Arabs of the interior, who were obstructing his wood-cutters on Anti-Libanus, Alexander sailed for Tyre, and found that, in spite of all difficulties, the new mole was nearly completed. The Tyrians, who had not heard of the defection of the Phœnician and Cyprian fleets, might

well be dismayed when they beheld this new and formidable force. They transported their wives, children and aged men to Carthage, from which they were informed that no active aid could be expected; and they prepared for a last struggle by blocking up the entrance of their harbour by a line of triremes.

“Finding it impossible to force his way into the Sidonian harbour, Alexander attacked and sunk the three outermost of the triremes, and then anchored under the lee of the mole, which had again advanced nearly to the walls of the city. The next day the Cyprian fleet stationed itself off the Sidonian harbour, the Phœnician off the Egyptian, near that part of the mole on which Alexander’s own tent was pitched. The attack upon the walls was resumed, and every device for assault or defence known in ancient warfare was put in force on both sides. Alexander had prepared a number of new machines, and brought engineers from Cyprus as well as Phœnicia to work them. Some were planted on the mole, some on the horse-transport, and some on the heaviest class of triremes. When these attempted to approach the walls in order to attack them with the battering-ram, they found the Tyrians had thrown large blocks of stone into the sea, by which their vessels were kept at a distance. The Macedonians attempted to weigh these up, but the unsteadiness of their ships gave them no sufficient purchase, and they endeavoured by anchoring them to prevent their rolling. The Tyrians on this, manning their small vessels and covering them to ward off missiles, came under their prows and sterns, and cut the cables by which they were moored. Alexander then fitted up some of his largest ships in a similar way, and placed them across before the anchors so as to prevent the approach of the Tyrians, but they sent divers, and cut the cables as before. The Macedonians then moored their ships with chains, and dragging up the stones, carried them away and sank them in deep water, so that they had unobstructed access to the foot of the walls.”

Space will not permit us to follow in detail the multitudinous contrivances, met by others equally skilful, and exhausting all the engineering resources of the time; the bold surprises, the gallant assaults, repelled with despairing but unflinching courage; the half-resolve of Alexander, after so many fruitless attempts, to abandon the siege; his new combinations of attack and final success against the worn-out defenders. The Macedonians at last, after a seven-months’ siege, in July, 332 B.C., by a simultaneous attack of the fleets on both harbours, and of the land forces from the mole, forced an entrance into the town, and, provoked by the obstinacy of the resistance and by the murder of some Macedonian prisoners, committed fearful atrocities. The city was burnt, 8000 inhabitants were killed, and the rest sold for slaves. Alexander replaced the population, which had been thus nearly exterminated, by Carian colonists. But he had to overcome a resistance almost as desperate, though less protracted, at Gaza, before his road was clear to Egypt, the next stage of his conquering progress.

Phœnicia, though the power of Tyre was broken, retained its

maritime enterprize and commercial activity and eminence, and was incorporated by Alexander, together with Syria and Cilicia, into a province of his new empire. We conclude our notice with an extract from the valuable final remarks of the author on the manner in which the history of this remarkable people has been generally treated, and the lesson that should be derived from it:

“The history of the Phœnician states has been treated too much from a polemical point of view. Their interests were in opposition to those of the Jews, who, regarding themselves as the favoured children of Providence, considered all hostility against their nation as impiety, and viewed with envy the riches which the science, the nautical and manufacturing skill, and the superior intelligence of Tyre and Sidon procured for their inhabitants. These feelings have been adopted by historians of other countries, and Phœnicia has been held up as an example of Divine vengeance on the arrogance, the luxury, and the selfishness, which commercial prosperity engenders. Yet no nation which enjoyed ascendancy in the ancient world conferred such benefits on the rest of mankind, and at the same time inflicted upon it so little injury, as Phœnicia. Its settlements were usually peaceful, it rarely aimed at conquest, and it diffused from the East to the farthest West the knowledge of letters and the advantages of commerce. . . . Another equally unfounded inference from the history of Phœnicia, is the hollowness and instability of a national prosperity founded on commerce. The lesson taught by Tyre is the reverse of this; it flourished as a commercial city during at least twenty-five centuries; it fell because it was not strong enough to protect its riches against aggressors; and it rose again after temporary depression with an elasticity that has no parallel. The spring of that elasticity was its commerce. It might have revived and flourished even under Turkish sway, had not the trade of the world found new channels for itself, since the discovery of the Cape of Good Hope and America, leaving dry many of its ancient seats on the coasts of the Mediterranean.”

We heartily commend this book to our readers, as not only being the best, or indeed the only thoroughly good, English work on Phœnicia, but as being rich in instructive matter for the merchant and manufacturer of the present day, no less than for the student of antiquity.

ON THE DATE OF THE CRUCIFIXION.

FIRST; according to the tradition of the Christians, as recorded by Lactantius, who wrote about A.D. 320, and by other Christian writers, the Saviour was crucified in the consulship of the two Gemini, that is, in the year of our era 29. These consuls held their office from January to Midsummer in that year.

Secondly; Origen, in his answer to Celsus, written about A.D. 220, says that the temple was destroyed by Titus *within* forty-two years of the crucifixion. The destruction took place,

according to Josephus, in September, A.D. 70, that is, forty-one years and a half after Easter, A.D. 29, the date of the crucifixion as stated above. These two authorities therefore confirm one another.

Thirdly; the evangelist Luke tells us that the Saviour's baptism by John took place in the fifteenth year of Tiberius. In Rome it was not the custom to date events by the year of an emperor's reign; and in the East, where it was the custom, they counted the years, not from the return of the day of accession, but from the civil new-year's day,—a rule which must be attended to, or we shall be a year wrong in our calculation.

Now Augustus died on the 19th of August, A.D. 14. Then began the first year of Tiberius. At Michaelmas, or about six weeks afterwards, fell the new-year's day in Palestine. Then began the second year of Tiberius, although he had only been emperor for those few weeks. In this way, the fifteenth of Tiberius began at Michaelmas, A.D. 27, when he had been emperor only thirteen years and a few weeks. The baptism was immediately followed by the fasting in the desert, which was probably at the time of the public fast of the Jews. This fixes the time for the beginning of the Saviour's ministry at the autumn of A.D. 27. If we then allow eighteen months for the length of the ministry, we are brought to Easter, A.D. 29, for the date of the crucifixion, as before.

Fourthly; the evangelist John places the Saviour's driving the dealers out of the temple shortly before the first Passover in his ministry; but the other evangelists place it shortly before the last Passover. The authority of the three would lead us to believe that the events in John, from ii. 13 to iii. 21, belong to the latter Passover; and the removal of this passage about transactions in Jerusalem is further required by the words which follow it, which say that the Saviour then, and not before, goes into Judea.

The removal of this passage to a later part of the Gospel carries with it an important chronological remark, for it was after driving the dealers out of the temple that the Saviour said that the temple of Jerusalem had been forty-and-six years in building. This, then, we must suppose to have been said within a few weeks or days of the crucifixion.

According to Josephus (*Antiq.* xiv. 15, 4), Herod began to reign at the time of the fast, that is, soon after Michaelmas, or at the beginning of the Jewish year, in the consulship of Agrippa and Gallus, or B.C. 37; and he began to rebuild the temple towards the end of the eighteenth year (*Antiq.* xv. 11, 1). This would be about Midsummer in B.C. 18; and forty-six years later brings us to Midsummer in A.D. 28. When the Saviour, therefore, speaking shortly before the Passover, said that the temple had already been forty-six years in building, he must have

made that remark in the spring of A.D. 29. This, again, fixes that year as the date of the crucifixion.

Fifthly; in the year A.D. 29, the first new moon after the spring equinox fell on the noon of Saturday, the 2nd of April. That day, therefore, was the first day of the month of Nisan. The fourteenth day was a Saturday, or Sabbath. That day was the feast of Unleavened Bread, when the Passover was to be slain, and it was to be eaten that same evening after sunset (see Exod. xii. xiii.). This gives a full agreement with John's Gospel, where we are told that the crucifixion took place on the day of Preparation, or day before the Passover, on a year when the following day was a High Sabbath, because it was at the same time the Sabbath and the Passover. That day, according to these calculations, was Friday, the 15th of April, A.D. 29.

Here, however, agreement ends and difficulties begin. Matthew, Mark and Luke say that the last supper of our Lord with his disciples was the Passover supper, and that the crucifixion took place after the Passover, and not before that feast, as we read in John. To reconcile the two accounts is hopeless. We must believe that one or other is incorrect; and upon an examination of all particulars, we shall find that more are satisfactorily explained by supposing that the Passover followed the crucifixion as we are told by John, than by supposing that the Passover supper was before the crucifixion, as stated by the other three. Indeed, the other three evangelists seem to contradict themselves, when they place the day of Preparation after the Passover, and make it a preparation for the Sabbath. Only one Preparation service is known to the Jews, namely, that on the search for leaven after sunset, twenty-four hours before the Passover supper.

In one point also the account in John is contradicted by the Jewish tradition. According to the Jews, when the 14th day of the month, the day of the Passover, falls on a Sabbath, then the Preparation, or ceremonial search for leaven, is to take place not on Friday evening, because then the Sabbath has begun and all such work is improper, but one day earlier, namely, on Thursday evening. According to this view of the case, we ought to suppose, after reading John's Gospel alone, that the crucifixion took place on Thursday.

And, lastly, to complete the difficulty, the evangelists, writing about events which happened in Judea, where the evening was counted as the beginning of the day, but writing in Greek and to be understood by Greeks, who counted the evening as the end of the day, have left us in doubt which custom they were following in the use of these most common words. But upon the whole it seems probable that the first three evangelists mean to say, that the crucifixion took place on Thursday before noon, the preparation service on Thursday when the sun set, the burial on Thursday night, and the preparation of spices and application

to Pilate for a guard on Friday, but before sunset, when the Sabbath began.

The day of the crucifixion, therefore, according to the above testimony and calculations, corrected by such conjectures as seem best to reconcile the first three Gospels with the fourth, was Thursday, the 14th of April, A.D. 29.

S. S.

ON THE ROMAN GOVERNORS OF SYRIA AT THE TIME OF THE BIRTH OF CHRIST.

FEW passages in any ancient writer are encumbered with more difficulties than the commencement of the second chapter of the third Gospel (Luke ii. 1, 2), in which the time of the birth of Christ is fixed by a reference to a census ordered by Augustus, "when Cyrenius was governor of Syria." It is one of the passages against which Strauss, in his "*Leben Jesu*," has especially directed his attack, as containing gross contradictions to acknowledged facts, and therefore decidedly proving the unhistorical character of the Gospel. A statement of these difficulties, which have long exercised the ingenuity of the learned, is given by Lardner (Vol. I. p. 248), together with a very full discussion of them; and a more recent treatment of them, with a reply to Strauss, is due to Tholuck, the substance of whose remarks has been made accessible to English readers by the present learned Professor of Critical and Exegetical Theology in Manchester New College, in Dr. Beard's *Voices of the Church*, p. 119.

The objections to the passage are thus stated by Tholuck (*Voices of the Church*, p. 130):

"We are here informed that Jesus was born at Bethlehem during a visit of his parents to that town, occasioned by the general census of the Roman empire, ordered by Augustus. It is objected, however, that no author of the period ever mentions any such general census; and that, therefore, this statement is manifestly unhistorical. The attempt has been made to obviate the difficulty by supposing the evangelist to mean by the words *πᾶσα ἡ οἰκουμένη* ('all the world,' Eng. version), not the whole Roman empire, but simply the land of Judæa (all the *land*). But this, even if admissible, does not much assist us; for, as Jesus was born before the death of Herod, Judæa was not yet a Roman province, and hence no census could be ordered in it by the Roman emperor. Moreover, it was not made a province till some ten years after Herod's death, when Archelaus was deposed and banished, and his dominions annexed to Syria. Some writers have, however, endeavoured to shew that Augustus might have ordered a census to be taken in the dominions of Herod preparatory to the division of his kingdom among his sons, after his death. But even this supposition does not remove the difficulties of the passage. Luke tells us that Cyrenius was, at the time

of the census, proconsul of Syria; whereas he did not assume that office till eleven or twelve years after the birth of Christ, when he was sent from Rome, on occasion of the deposition of Archelaus, to change Judæa into a province, and institute a general taxation of its inhabitants. At the birth of Jesus, Sentius Saturninus was proconsul of Syria, as we learn both from Josephus and Tertullian. Hence, then, if the census of Judæa did not take place till some eleven or twelve years after our Lord's birth, the cause assigned for the visit of his parents to Bethlehem could not have existed, and the narration of the birth at Bethlehem must be given up as unhistorical."

It appears to be a mistake here to say that Josephus makes Saturninus to be governor at this time; but the above may be taken as the substance of the objector's case.

It may be observed here, that various not inadmissible suppositions have been made, which would remove most of the objections, except that one which is raised to the assertion that Cyrenius was governor at this time. But Josephus gives so particular an account of his being sent as governor eight or ten years later, and so circumstantially mentions Quintilius Varus as governor at, and even after, Herod's death, that Luke's assertion seems quite irreconcilable with historical truth, and remains one of the most formidable difficulties of the New-Testament history. Lardner gives, at great length, the solutions that had been proposed up to his time. Baronius alone, of the numerous critics who had treated this puzzling question, thought that Cyrenius was twice governor,—once at this period, and afterwards when Archelaus was deposed. But in this, as Lardner says, "he has been deserted by all learned men. For none of the defenders of Beza's solution, who maintain the double census of Cyrenius, do say that Cyrenius was twice ordinary president of Syria." Certainly no proof at all satisfactory has been ever given of this. Lardner's own conclusion, after considering all the others, is, that Cyrenius made the census, not as ordinary governor, but as a commissioner sent by the emperor with extraordinary powers for that special purpose. The solution adopted by Tholuck seems to be the one originally proposed by Herwaert, which makes the words translated, "*was first made when Cyrenius was governor,*" equivalent to, "*was made before Cyrenius was governor,*" &c. This depends upon a point of philological criticism, and is not altogether free from the charge of doing violence to the idiom of the Greek language. Still, this solution seems at present the one most generally favoured, and is acquiesced in by the learned, not because it is quite satisfactory in itself, but because, as yet, no better has been found.

Nor, indeed, considering the deficient and contradictory evidence we possess of the period, ought we, perhaps, to expect that a perfect solution will ever be arrived at. The exact succession of the governors of the provinces of the immense empire

of Rome is often exceedingly difficult, sometimes impossible, to ascertain; and the task is still more troublesome when the relations of the provinces were in an unsettled or transition state, as was the case with Syria and Judæa at this time. With respect to the point before us, we find three ancient writers each differing from the others; Luke giving us Cyrenius; Josephus, Quintilius Varus; and Tertullian, Sentius Saturninus, as governor. It is clear that two at least of these authorities must be wrong; but were the error ever so clearly proved against them, it would be absurd to infer thence that all the rest of their writings are untrustworthy or unhistorical. It is one of those cases of conflicting evidence, where, without impugning the honesty, or even the general correctness, of our witnesses, we must acknowledge that one or more of them has certainly made a mistake. The most, perhaps, that can be hoped for in such cases is, that the discovery of new evidence, or deeper investigation into the antiquities of the period, may throw some fresh light on obscure points, and bring us somewhat nearer the solution we are seeking.

In a recent publication of A. W. Zumpt, of Berlin,* who, in the department of Roman Antiquities, no less than of Latin Philology, has worthily succeeded to the eminence of his distinguished uncle, there is a long and learned "Commentatio" or Essay on the Roman Governors of Syria (*De Syria Romanorum Provincia ab Cæsare Augusto ad T. Vespasianum*), a portion of which relates so immediately to the passage in Luke, and throws upon it so curious and unexpected a light, that we feel assured that a summary of the reasoning and chief results arrived at by the author will be acceptable to our readers. The object of the essay is to trace the series of governors of Syria from Augustus to Vespasian, i.e. through a period of little less than a hundred years, from 30 B.C. to 66 A.D.; and the portion with which we are more immediately concerned is that extending from about 6 B.C. to 6 A.D.

Sentius Saturninus, who had been consul in 19 B.C., succeeded M. Titius in the province of Syria in the year 9 B.C., which he governed for three years. In the year 2 or 3 A.D., he was sent by Augustus into Germany, whence he was called, A.D. 6, to put down a revolt of the Pannonians and Dalmatians, and was succeeded by Varus, who is also next in the series of the governors of Syria, and whose name is best known in connection with the terrible disaster, A.D. 9, in which, through his own imprudence, he lost his legions and his life in the *Salus Teutoburgiensis*.

That P. Quintilius Varus succeeded Saturninus in Syria, we learn from Josephus.† He is there mentioned in connection with

* Augusti Wilhelmi Zumptii Commentationum Epigraphicarum ad Antiquitates Romanas pertinentium Volumen Alterum. Berolini, apud F. Dümmlerum. 1854.

† Antiq. xvii. 5, 2.

the trial of Antipater by his father Herod at Jerusalem. This took place in the year B.C. 5, and Herod died at the beginning of April of the following year. But Josephus mentions Varus as president of Syria after this—as having come to Judea himself on learning the death of Herod—then returning to Antioch—then again, when Archelaus was gone to Rome to be confirmed in his kingdom by Augustus, as quelling a violent disturbance which had broken out in Jerusalem at the feast of Pentecost,* a circumstance mentioned also by Tacitus.† He must therefore have remained governor up to the end of the year 4 B.C. There is, however, no account of his leaving the province, nor of any subsequent proceedings of his in it. And Josephus, both in his *Antiquities* and his *Jewish War*, has at this period an unaccountable lacuna in his narrative; for after describing the circumstances of the accession of Archelaus and his confirmation by Augustus, he immediately passes on to his deposition and banishment, omitting all notice of affairs in the interval, though extending over ten years and by no means barren of important incidents, such as the visit of Caius Cæsar, adopted son of Augustus, to Asia, and the Parthian war, which it is difficult to see how Josephus could have passed over in silence. It is, therefore, not known exactly when Varus quitted Syria, and we lose sight of him till his appointment to the command in Germany, A.D. 7. His disastrous end there is narrated by Velleius.‡ He was allied by marriage to the imperial house, having married Claudia Pulchra; and his son married Julia, daughter of Germanicus.

At this point of the investigation direct evidence fails us, and we find no one expressly recorded by historians as governor of Syria till the appointment of P. Sulp. Quirinius (the Cyrenius of Josephus) in A.D. 6. How was the interval filled up? Assuredly Varus was not governor during all this time, a space of eleven years, from 6 B.C. to 6 A.D. Noris§ supposed that the name of some intermediate governor had been lost. For one of the maxims on which Augustus acted, by the advice, as Dio Cassius|| informs us, of Mæcenas, was that no governor should hold an imperial province for less than three nor more than five years; the object being to ensure their complete acquaintance with the province, and yet prevent their becoming so firmly settled in it as to attempt to be independent of the emperor. It is therefore impossible to suppose that a principal province, with the command of three legions, should have been left in the hands of one man for more than twice the longest period allowed. Since Noris wrote, indeed, there has been discovered the name of one governor of Syria during this interval, viz. L. Volusius Saturninus, whose name, as *legatus Syriæ*, is found on a coin of An-

* *Antiq.* xvii. 9, 3; 10, 9.

† *Hist.* v. 9—.

‡ Velleius, ii. 118 seq.

§ *Cenotaphium Pisanum*, iii. 16, 11.

|| *lii.* 23.

tioch of the year 35 of the (Actiatic) era of Antioch, which year begins with the autumn of A.D. 4; and he must have continued till the arrival of Quirinius (Cyrenius) in A.D. 6. This L. Volusius was consul suffectus in the year 12 B.C., in the place of Quirinius, and his death is noticed by Tacitus.* But his proconsulate alone is not sufficient to fill the time we have mentioned as unoccupied; so that we must conclude that one governor at least intervened between Varus, whom we do not find later than 4 B.C., and Volusius, whom we first hear of at the end of 4 A.D.; and there is no difficulty in supposing there were two.

The problem, then, is to find, if possible, these missing governors; and here the passage of Luke presents itself, and is first noticed by the author of the essay. He does not, however, profess to enter on all the difficulties with which it is encumbered, or the various other questions arising from it. But before proceeding to the special object to which he intends to confine himself, he makes the following observations on the question of the date of Christ's birth, and on the interpretation which is now generally adopted of the words, "αὐτῇ ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηνίου," and which makes it equivalent to πρότερον ἐγένετο ἡγ. τ. Σ. Κ. :

"Though we were to concede that this is not contrary to the idiom of the Greek language (which may, however, not unreasonably be questioned), I observe it to be a departure from the natural and obvious interpretation, and that those who maintain it would be glad to abandon it if any other could be found.† It is also a complete departure from the opinion of the earliest Fathers of the Christian faith, who followed the authority of Luke or similar testimony, but so that they considered that both the census made by Quirinius, and the birth of Christ, took place at the end of B.C. 3, or the beginning of B.C. 2. Eusebius says distinctly,‡ 'This then was the forty-second year of the reign of Augustus, and the twenty-eighth from the reduction of Egypt and the death of Antony and Cleopatra, with whom the dynasty of the Ptolemies in Egypt ceased, when our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ was born in Bethlchem of Judæa, according to the prophecies concerning him, 'ἐπὶ τῆς τότε πρώτης ἀπογραφῆς, ἡγεμονεύοντος Κυρηνίου τῆς Συρίας,' at the time of the census which then first took place, Cyrenius being governor of Syria.' It is clear that the reign of Augustus is reckoned from the year 43 B.C., when he was first made consul, from which the 42nd (counting in the Roman method) falls in B.C. 3, which is also the 28th from the reduction of Egypt. There is therefore no doubt that Eusebius believed that both the census

* Annals, iii. 30.

† We observe that the Rev. H. Alford, in his very useful and fully annotated edition of the Greek Testament, though dissatisfied with this or any other interpretation yet given, nevertheless believes that the solution must be sought in the interpretation of this word πρώτη. If Zumpt's conclusion in this dissertation be accepted, the translation would be, "This was the first assessment or census of Cyrenius, governor of Syria," which Lardner says had for some time appeared to him to be the genuine meaning of the words.

‡ Hist. Eccles. i. 5.

was made and Christ was born in the year 3 B.C.; as likewise Irenæus,* Tertullian,† Clemens Alexandrinus.‡ Three questions are here to be distinguished: first, in what year Christ was born; second, what was the nature of the census, and whether it was the first of Augustus the emperor, or of Quirinius the governor (for this, although scarcely discussed by the learned, is a very proper subject of inquiry); third, whether Quirinius was governor, and when. For it is possible that in the year 3 B.C., so called, Quirinius may have governed Syria, but Christ not have been born, nor the census made. These questions being then distinct, I shall here, confining myself to my proposed subject, discuss only that concerning Quirinius; for assuredly, since he is called governor of Syria, he cannot be passed over.”

The principal passage concerning him is that of Tacitus,§ where, relating his death and public funeral in the year 21 A.D., he takes occasion to mention his principal services. Nothing is known of the active services which gained him the favour of Augustus; but his consulship was from January to August, B.C. 12, when L. Volusius Saturninus was his successor, as mentioned above. Subsequently he gained triumphal honours for reducing the fortresses of the Homonadenses, and the question arises, of what province was he governor at the time? To find this, we must ascertain the situation of these Homonadenses. Pliny|| places them in the remote parts of Cilicia, near the Isauri, and says they had more than forty strongholds among the rugged valleys of the country. Strabo mentions them several times; in one passage,¶ he places them in Cilicia aspera, near the Isaurians; in another,** near the Pisidians; and in a third,†† he reckons them with the Isaurians, and mentions their reduction by Quirinius.

In carrying out this inquiry as to the province of which Quirinius was governor at this period, i.e. between 12 B.C., when he was consul, and 1 B.C., when, as will be shewn, he was appointed “rector” or official adviser of C. Cæsar, Zumpt takes the four, or at most five, provinces which can by possibility be imagined to have had any connection with the Homonadenses, and shews, by a very elaborate process of exhaustion, that one only is free from fatal objections. We will not apply what might appear a similar exhaustive method to the patience of our lay readers, by following the details of the arguments in the case of all these provinces, but, referring to the original essay those whose familiarity with Roman antiquities may enable them to

* Adv. Hær. iii. 25.

† Tert. adv. Judæos, c. viii. p. 89.

‡ Strom. i. p. 147.

§ Ann. iii. 48. Nihil ad veterem et patriciam Sulpiciorum familiam Quirinius pertinuit, ortus apud municipium Lanuvium; sed impiger militiæ et acerbis ministeriis consulatum sub divo Augusto, mox expugnatis per Ciliciam Homonadensium castellis insignia triumphû adeptus datusque rector C. Cæsari Armeniam obtinenti Tiberium quoque Rhodi agentem coluerat. Quod tunc patefecit (Tiberius) in senatu laudatis in se officiis et incusato M. Lollio, quem auctorem C. Cæsari pravitatis et discordiarum arguebat.

|| Nat. Hist. v. 23, 94.

¶ xiv. 4, 1.

** xiv. 4, 24.

†† xii. 6, 5.

estimate the force of the reasoning, we will merely indicate its course and results.

First, then, he rejects Asia (which Mommsen and Bergmann have recently proposed), because Florus informs us that Quirinius was once governor of Africa and gained victories there, and it was not the custom for any one to be appointed to more than one of the consular and prætorian provinces which were in the appointment of the senate. Again, even if he had been proconsul of Asia, his victory over the Homonadenses could not be referred to that proconsulate, because, firstly, they inhabited a district remote from the province; and secondly, because Asia, an old and perfectly tranquil province, had no legions quartered in it, as is known from Tacitus.*

Partly the same objections apply to Pontus and Bithynia, the second province of the East which might be suggested. It was separated from the Homonadenses by Galatia intervening; it was a senatorial province, and had no troops quartered in it; besides which, it was usually given to men of prætorian and not consular rank, as Quirinius was.†

To Galatia the objections are less obvious, because the Homonadenses were very near its frontier. But that the part of Cilicia which they inhabited was not within it, Strabo sufficiently testifies; and the prætor of the neighbouring province had no jurisdiction or power to make war beyond his own boundaries. Nor did the governor of Galatia command any military force with which he could have earned triumphal honours; and lastly, Galatia, like Bithynia, was given to men of prætorian, not consular, rank.

Asia, Bithynia and Pontus, and Galatia, being disposed of, we come to Cilicia, which indeed at first sight would appear the likeliest of all, since the forts of the Homonadenses are said to have been in it. But Cilicia was now a very different province from the Cilicia of which Cicero was governor, which extended to Caria and Phrygia. Great part of it had now been added to Asia, and part given to Amyntas, king of Galatia, which, after his death, became part of the province of that name then constituted. Little, indeed, was left but the so-called Cilicia campestris, a district generally tranquil, but exposed to disturbance from some few fierce tribes still remaining. When, therefore, Augustus, in 27 B.C., handed over to the senate the more tranquil provinces, as no longer requiring the presence of a legionary force, he retained Cilicia, together with Cyprus, which had long previously been connected with it, as a prætorian province.‡ But when Amyntas died (to whom, as was mentioned, part of Cilicia had been given), Augustus, having made his dominions into the new province of Galatia, but without attaching to it

* Ann. iv. 5—.

† Dio, liii. 12.

‡ Ibid.

any permanent armed force, was yet quite aware that there were in the Cilicia which remained, tribes which would require for their coercion a stronger hand than that of Archelaus of Cappadocia, whom he had charged with the duty of keeping Cilicia aspera in check. He therefore separated Cilicia from Cyprus, giving this, in the year 22 B.C., as a completely tranquil province, to the senate.* But what became of Cilicia, concerning which at this period authorities give us no further information? It must not be inferred, from the silence of Dio, that it was made over with Cyprus at the same time to the senate. That this is inadmissible will appear at once, if we suppose (which is the only supposition that can follow) that Quirinius was appointed to govern it. For Cyprus was certainly a prætorian province; but any province which Quirinius might have at this time must have been a consular one. Cilicia, then, being separated from Cyprus, must either have been a province of itself, or have been attached to some other. The former is most unlikely; for, reduced as it had been by successive diminutions, it was now very small, and was, as we learn from Dio, without the protection of a legion. For which reason also, when the emperor assumed it (and that he did assume it, i. e. place it under imperial jurisdiction, must be inferred from his separating it from Cyprus when he gave that to the senate), he could not give it to a governor of consular, i. e. highest, rank, and, consequently, not to Quirinius. We are brought, then, to the second supposition, that it was joined to some other province. Now that it could not have been under the proconsul of Asia, is plain from what was said above about Quirinius's proconsulate of Africa; that it was not joined to Galatia, Strabo shews, who gives very exactly the boundaries of that province; Pontus and Bithynia are separated from it by a considerable extent of country. What, then, remains but to conclude that it was united with Syria?

This reasoning establishes the high probability at least of the junction of Cilicia with Syria at the period when Quirinius reduced the Homonadenses; and Zumpt proceeds to confirm this conclusion by more direct proof from the history of the immediately succeeding period. When Tiberius, jealous of the successes of Germanicus, was desirous of removing him, he sent him, in the year 17 A.D., into the East, with superior power over all the provinces; and at the same time appointed Cn. Piso, his bitter enemy, governor of Syria, who, by every annoyance malignity could devise, succeeded at length in exasperating Germanicus so far as to break off all friendly intercourse with him, and order him to quit the province.† Piso obeyed, but waited in the island of Cos till he should hear of the death of Germanicus, which it is believed he was himself taking secret means to

* Dio, liv. 4.

† Tac. Ann. ii. 70.

bring about. As soon as he received news of this event, and of the appointment of Cn. Sentius Saturninus, one of Germanicus's lieutenants, as interim governor of Syria till Tiberius should nominate a new governor, he resolved to attempt the recovery of the province by force of arms. For this purpose, he sent on Domitius Celer, one of his intimate friends, to Laodicea, in Syria, and *himself wrote to the petty kings of Cilicia demanding auxiliary troops*. These were chiefs of the mountain tribes of Taurus, and they accordingly sent troops, which Piso, when he made his attempt, incorporated with his other forces.* Now how could he have ventured to demand troops from the Cilician chiefs, unless his character as governor of Syria gave him authority to do so? Unless, indeed, he had had such authority, they would not have sent them at all, especially against Germanicus and his friends, who were come clothed with the highest powers and influence. It must have been, then, as governor of Syria that they obeyed him, and Cilicia must have been united with Syria. But this can be shewn even more fully. When Piso had collected his force, and advanced to recover the province of which he declared he had been unjustly deprived, his first step was to seize a fortified stronghold, not of Syria, but of Cilicia, called Celenderis,† from which he was with some difficulty driven by Sentius, who had marched against him. Let us now see what took place in Rome, when Piso, after the failure of his attempt against Syria, returned, and was accused by the friends of Germanicus. In the first place, Tiberius, having referred the charge to the hearing of the senate, made a speech when the trial came on, in the course of which he said,‡ “You will also consider whether Piso, with turbulent and seditious motives, tampered with the army and sought to win them over to his personal ends, and whether he sought to recover his province by arms; or whether these charges have been falsely brought or exaggerated.” Piso had attempted to recover his province in two ways: by sending Dom. Celer to Laodicea to win over the sixth legion, which was quartered there; and by seizing the fort of Celenderis. But the first of these had been frustrated at once, so that the “*armis repetita provincia*” of Tiberius must refer to the only attempt that was really executed, the occupation of Celenderis. Nothing is said about attacking a province not belonging to him; that would have been a very different and more serious offence, which Tiberius never could have thought of pardoning; but his offence was that, having been ejected from his province, and another having been placed in it *ad interim*, he, instead of waiting and appealing to the emperor, as he ought to have done, to settle the disputed possession, took the law into his own hands by marching an armed

* Tac. Ann. ii. 78—80.

† Ibid. ii. 80. Strabo, xiv. 4, 3.

‡ Tac. Ann. iii. 12.

force against it. Thus Tacitus says that among other causes why Piso perished was this, that the emperor was implacable, "*ob bellum provinciæ (not alienæ provinciæ) illatum.*"* And the same thing appears from the letter which he wrote just before his death to Tiberius, interceding for his sons, one of whom, he says, was all the while at Rome, the other (who was probably one of his father's lieutenants, and took an active part in the attempt) had endeavoured to dissuade him from the attempt to recover Syria. And this attempt consisted, as we have seen, in seizing a fort in Cilicia.

We conclude, then, that from the time when Cyprus was given to the senate, Cilicia was transferred to Syria, and governed by the same *legatus Cæsaris*. And it seems to have remained thus united under the succeeding emperors, probably till the time of Vespasian. A proof of this is found in Tacitus,† who says that the *Clitæ*, a tribe then under the rule of Archelaus of Cappadocia, being impatient of the taxes and tribute imposed on them, withdrew to the fastnesses of Mount Taurus, where they maintained themselves against the feeble force of Archelaus, until Trebellius was sent by Vitellius, governor of Syria, who forced them to surrender. This was in 36 A.D. And again in 53 A.D., the same tribe again rose,‡ and not only occupied the mountains, but ravaged the country as far as the sea. On this occasion, too, a force was sent from Syria under the prefect Curtius Severus. But where were these *Clitæ* situated? Tacitus himself informs us that *they were a tribe of Cilicia aspera*. On both these occasions, then, troops were sent by the governors of Syria to put down disturbances in Cilicia, so that it is certain that Cilicia was in their jurisdiction, and was joined to their province.

It can, then, admit of no reasonable doubt that P. Sulp. Quirinius, at the time when he reduced the strongholds of the *Homonadenses* in Cilicia, was *legatus Augusti* or governor of Syria. Now as to the time when this took place. Since Tacitus, in the passage first cited, states it to have been between the year 12 B.C., when Quirinius was consul, and the death of C. Cæsar, (adopted) son of Augustus, which took place in the year 4 A.D., it cannot have been his second governorship of Syria, recorded by Josephus and others, which commenced in the year 6 A.D. And this period of fifteen years, which the words of Tacitus allow, is again limited by the circumstance that other governors, whose names we know, held the province till the end of the year 4 B.C.; so that from fifteen years we are reduced to seven or eight. But the time may be still more nearly determined by a reference to the connection with C. Cæsar, mentioned in the passage of Tacitus first quoted. Zumpt accordingly traces very carefully the circumstances of the Asiatic journey of C. Cæsar,

* Tac. Ann. iii. 14.

† Ibid. vi. 41.

‡ Ibid. xii. 55.

who was sent by Augustus to arrange the affairs of Armenia, then unsettled by disputes about the succession. He believes the following points to be sufficiently established. C. Cæsar left Rome at the beginning of B.C. 1, and crossing first to Greece, where he made a tour to see the most celebrated spots, passed next to Egypt, and thence by the coast of Palestine to Samos, where he wintered, and where Tiberius, then staying at Rhodes in a kind of political exile, came to visit him. Suetonius, mentioning this visit, says that Tiberius perceived that Lollius, attached to Caius as "rector" or adviser, had endeavoured to produce an estrangement between them; which agrees with what Tacitus says he complained of in the senate long afterwards. Here, also, Caius entered on his consulship for A.D. 1, and then proceeded to Asia and Syria. After various letters had passed between him and Phraates, king of the Parthians and opponent of Roman influence in Armenia, Phraates, towards the end of the year, inclined to peace; and an interview took place at the beginning of the following year, A.D. 2, between Cæsar and the son of the Parthian king, at which intimation was given to Cæsar of misconduct on the part of his "rector" Lollius, who in consequence was dismissed, and Caius, his dissatisfaction with Lollius rendering him more friendly towards Tiberius, permitted him to return to Rome, which he did in August, just before the death of Caius's brother Lucius at Massilia. Peace having been made with Phraates, by which the Parthians agreed not to interfere in Armenia, Caius commenced hostilities against Tigranes, the Armenian pretender; was wounded in besieging a town, probably in 3 A.D.; and died on the 21st of February, A.D. 4.

The dates, then, at which M. Lollius is mentioned as "rector" to Caius Cæsar, seem to be from the end of B.C. 1 or beginning of A.D. 1, when he was wintering at Samos, to some time in A.D. 2, when he died by his own hand, soon after losing the friendship of the prince. But when was Quirinius rector to Cæsar? Noris thinks he succeeded Lollius, because Tacitus says, "rector additus C. Cæsari Armeniam obtinenti;" and Armenia was not taken possession of till A.D. 2. But this alone is quite insufficient; for "provinciam obtinere" is not necessarily to hold it as a conquered country, but to have it as a field of operations.* And it was to settle Armenia and its affairs that C. Cæsar was sent from Rome. There are also two other objections to this opinion of Noris. The first is found in the statement of Tacitus, "insignia triumphi adeptus datusque rector C. Cæsari Armeniam obtinenti Tiberium quoque Rhodi agentem coluerat;" which words do not, as Noris supposes, imply that Quirinius had paid court to Tiberius before he gained his triumphal insignia and

* Thus in B.C. 147, when Scipio went to conduct the war against Carthage, the senate gave him Africa "as his province."

was made rector to Cæsar, for the pluperfect refers not to these, but to the time of his funeral, which Tacitus is relating. And Zumpt thinks it evident that this gaining of honours, and paying court to Tiberius, and being appointed rector to Cæsar, all took place at the same period, when Quirinius was holding office in the East; and when we remember that Tiberius had been staying some half-dozen years at Rhodes, and left it almost immediately after Lollius ceased to be "rector" to Cæsar, we shall conclude that Quirinius had paid court to him before, and was the predecessor, not the successor, of Lollius in this office. Another circumstance also leads to the same conclusion. Tacitus* is relating the accusation brought by Quirinius, in the year 20 A.D., against his wife Lepida, "*qui dimissam eam e matrimonio post vicesimum annum veneni olim in se comparati arguebat.*" Consequently, Lepida married him twenty years before these proceedings were taken. Now we learn from Tacitus that Lepida was the intended wife of L. Cæsar, who died A.D. 2; and for her, left free by this event, to have married Quirinius anything like twenty years before these proceedings, the marriage must have taken place almost immediately, and Quirinius must have been at the time in Rome, and not in Syria as the successor of Lollius, as Noris supposes. The inference, therefore, is that Quirinius was rector to C. Cæsar from the commencement of his mission to the East, i.e. from the beginning of B.C. 1, and remained so for about a year, till Lollius succeeded him about the beginning of A.D. 1. One question remains on this part of the subject, viz., Who was the successor of Lollius? This is answered by Velleius:† *Sed quam hunc (M. Lollium) decessisse lætati homines, tam paulo post obisse Censorinum in iisdem provinciis graviter tulit civitas.* His successor, then, for a short time, was C. Marcus Censorinus.

It will be of some importance, both in confirming the governorship of Quirinius, and tracing his successors, to glance for a moment at the nature of this office of "rector." It was quite distinct from the personal retinue or staff (*cohors*) which attended a governor or prince; nor was it the business of his "rector" to regulate the private conduct of Caius Cæsar. His duty was to counsel and direct all his public acts, and especially all military measures. Caius was young, unpractised in diplomacy and war, and sent nevertheless into the East, with powers superior to any provincial governor, to arrange matters requiring great firmness, tact and local information. That these indispensable qualities might be combined with that prestige of personal rank which his relationship to Augustus gave, it was necessary to attach to him an officer of ability and experience. And as the affairs on which he was sent were such as would otherwise have devolved on the proconsul of Syria for the time being (whose province was not

* Ann. iii. 48.

† ii. 102.

only the principal one of the East, but that to which Armenian and Parthian affairs properly belonged), he would be the most obvious person to hold so responsible a post. This would be the more necessary, as his co-operation would, in any case, be afterwards required to carry out any arrangement concluded on; for Caius had no regular army or separate province of his own. The instance to which we have already once referred is instructive on this point, shewing how essential in such cases was the assistance of the governor of Syria. When Tiberius, jealous of the successes and growing popularity of his nephew Germanicus, recalled him from his brilliant career in Germany, he sent him, A.D. 17, on a mission to Armenia and the East very similar to this of C. Cæsar; but his object was to lessen the popularity, if not to bring about the death, of the favourite of the Roman people. He therefore removed from Syria the then governor, Creticus Silanus, who was a friend of Germanicus, and appointed Piso, whom he knew to be his enemy, for the purpose of obstructing and harassing him, in which he was only too successful. But that it was ostensibly to aid him, appears from the words of the imperial hypocrite himself to the senate:* "*Patris sui legatum atque amicum Pisonem fuisse, adiutoremque Germanico datum a se, auctore senatu, rebus apud Orientem administrandis.*" We may well believe that the terms of Piso's instructions would be to give him every aid, and there can be as little doubt that Tiberius, in other matters fond of following the precedents of Augustus, intended to appear to do so in the appointment of Piso. It may be observed, that the officer who in the case of Germanicus, the already successful general, is called "adjutor," would in the case of Caius, an inexperienced youth of twenty, be properly called "rector."

We have seen, then, that by the natural requirements of the case, the governor of Syria for the time being would almost certainly be chosen as the adviser of a prince in the position of Caius or Germanicus; that these offices were actually united in the case of Piso; and that Quirinius, who was rector of C. Cæsar, appears to have been about the same time governor of Syria. The inference is that these offices were afterwards also held by the same individual, and that Lollius and Censorinus, who followed Quirinius in the former, succeeded him also in the latter, and were the next in the list of governors of Syria. It is remarked by Zumpt, as significant and confirmatory of this, that in the passage in Velleius, in which Censorinus is mentioned as apparently succeeding Lollius, more than one "provincia" or office is ascribed to them; not "*in eâdem provincia,*" but "*in iisdem provinciis obisse graviter tulit civitas.*"

Such are the principal arguments brought forward by the

* Tac. Ann. xiii. 12.

learned author of this dissertation, in treating this portion of his series of the governors of Syria. We will only add, with respect to Quirinius, that after a critical examination of an inscription (Orelli, n. 623), first published by Ursati in 1719, in which the name of P. Sulp. Quirinius occurs in connection with Syria, and which some have referred to his first proconsulate, Zumpt pronounces it a manifest forgery and unworthy of notice. We will now, therefore, without following in detail the subsequent governors, give the list as presented by him, referring the scholar to the dissertation itself, which he will find full of curious and instructive matter, as well as a model of pure Ciceronian Latinity.

| | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------|----------------------------|--------|
| Q. Didius | anno 30 A.C. | P. Sulp. Quirinius | 6 P.C. |
| M. Messalla Corvinus | 29 | Q. Cæc. Creticus Silanus.. | 11 |
| M. Tullius Cicero | 28 | Cn. Calpurnius Piso | 17 |
| A. Ter. Murena.. ab anno | 28 | L. Ælius Lamia | 21 |
| C. Sentius Saturninus.... | 26 | L. Pomponius Flaccus, anno | 33 |
| M. Agrippa ab anno | 23 | L. Vitellius..... ab anno | 35 |
| M. Titius..... | 13 | P. Petronius | 39 |
| C. Sentius Saturninus.... | 9 | C. Vibius Marsus..... | 42 |
| P. Quintilius Varus..... | 6 | C. Cassius Longinus | 45 |
| P. Sulp. Quirinius | 4 | C. Ummidius Quadratus.. | 50 |
| M. Lollius | ab anno 1 | Domitius Corbulo | 61 |
| C. Marcius Censorinus, anno | 3 P.C. | C. Cestius Gallus..... | 63 |
| L. Vol. Saturninus, ab anno | 4 | C. Licinius Mucianus | 66 |

It may be well also to sum up briefly the results of the arguments we have been considering in detail. They are, then:

That Sentius Saturninus was governor of Syria from the year 9 B.C. to 6 B.C.

Quintilius Varus succeeded him in 6 B.C., and remained about three years, till after the death of Herod.

Publius Sulpicius Quirinius succeeded to the province on the departure of Varus, probably about the end of B.C. 4, remaining about three years. He reduced the Homonadenses of Cilicia, and in the last year of his government was "rector" to C. Cæsar, then on his mission to the East, till the end of B.C. 1, when he returned to Rome.

M. Lollius then succeeded him in the province and in the rectorship of Cæsar; but, his avarice and corrupt conduct having been exposed, was dismissed by Cæsar, and, according to Pliny, poisoned himself (see Orelli's *Excursus* to Hor., *Od.* iv. 9), probably A. D. 2, and was succeeded by

Caius Marcius Censorinus, both as proconsul and adviser to Cæsar. His period in these offices was short, as he died probably in the next year, A. D. 3, or not later than the beginning of A. D. 4, certainly before the death of C. Cæsar in Lycia in February of that year.

L. Volusius Saturninus is mentioned as governor in A. D. 4; we may assume, therefore, that he remained also the following

year, as there is not time for an intermediate governor between this and the second proconsulate of

P. Sulp. Quirinius, who came A. D. 6, immediately after the deposition of Archelaus, to make Judæa a Roman province and take a census of its inhabitants. Nothing more is related by Josephus concerning his administration, nor is it known when he quitted the province. But as his successor, Creticus Silanus, was in the province in A. D. 11, the probability is that Quirinius remained the full term of five years.

It is unnecessary to dwell further upon the particulars of the other governors, whose names and dates in the list given above are in some cases deduced from evidence more scanty than we have concerning Quirinius; and an examination of the years will shew some considerable lacunæ. Our object has been to give some account of researches which seem to throw an unexpected light upon a very difficult period of New-Testament history, though it may, of course, fail to remove all the obscurities which surround it. The objections to the census, drawn principally from the silence of contemporary history, remain as they were, and there is a positive discrepancy between the accounts of Luke and Josephus as to who was governor in the year commonly assigned as that of Christ's birth.

The objection from the silence of other historians is, as has been truly observed by Lardner and others, of little weight. If we were to deny the truth of everything that has not been recorded by more than one writer, the field of ancient and modern history would be wonderfully contracted. It is said, however, that Josephus, when he was relating the arrival of Cyrenius in A. D. 6, and mentioning his rank and honours, would scarcely have failed to introduce a circumstance so pertinent as his previous governorship of the same province. No doubt it would have been quite natural to do so; but then he has omitted many other things equally natural and much more important,—events, for instance, of public interest, which took place in the ten years immediately preceding. How are we to account for his total omission of these? How must we explain the fact that Tacitus does not mention either of his proconsulates of Syria, nor his proconsulate of Africa and victories there, which, nevertheless, in recounting his services, he would most properly have done? Many reasons might be suggested for such omissions: the historian might fear to be thought tedious if he recorded everything; or the point might not enter into his scope and purpose at the time; or he may not have thought of it, or been quite certain about it, at the moment.

Nor will the placing Cyrenius as governor in the year 4 B. C., instead of Varus, be considered fatal to the credibility of Luke, if it involves only the error of one year, and if we only demand from him what we are content with in other historians,—an

honest presentation of the materials he has been able to collect. Unless, indeed, we place the evangelist on equal ground with Josephus and Tacitus, and make the same allowances for involuntary error and imperfect information, it is unfair to bring them together at all into the arena of historical criticism. Let us at any rate be consistent, and admit that if discrepancies are to prove nothing against the absolute accuracy of a sacred writer, undesigned coincidences should have no value in its favour. This absolute accuracy, then, we do not assert; but we say that, not knowing the means he had for learning the circumstances of the birth of Christ, and considering that, of the events of the life of even the most eminent, their birth is that which (except among the highest ranks) is the most difficult to fix, it is not very astonishing that Luke should have erred a year in its date, or have connected it with circumstances which his authorities, perhaps mistakenly, had attached to it. Even in modern times, with all our advantages for recording and transmitting these minutiae of history, how hard it is sometimes to determine them! "The life of Milton," observes Dr. Beard in his *Voices of the Church*, "has been repeatedly written. The register of his birth, and his biographer Todd, fix the time when he was born as the ninth of December, 1608. Another biographer, Toland,—who wrote near Milton's own time,—says he was born in 1606; while Hallam declares 'John Milton was born in 1609.'" Many such discrepancies might be added. Let us mention a much more recent one. The controversies must be fresh in every reader's recollection, which occupied the newspaper public shortly after the death of the great Duke, as to both the date and the place of his birth. Colonel Gurwood states that he was born in 1769, on the 1st of May, and, if we mistake not, he himself used to keep this as his birthday. But the register of his baptism, in St. Peter's church, Dublin, is dated April 30th. Again, the best authorities give the place of the event, with all minuteness, as 114, Grafton Street, parish of St. Andrew's, Dublin. On the other hand, a witness before a Committee of the Irish Commons, in 1790, in the matter of an election petition, swore that she was present at his birth in the month of March, at Dangan Castle, co. Meath; and that this was the place is confirmed by the monumental evidence of the Wellington column, erected to him at the county town of Trim. It is presumable, however, that no myth-loving sceptic will venture just yet, on the strength of these discrepancies, to deny that the Duke was ever born anywhere.

In fine, the most formidable, the only insuperable, difficulty in the passage of Luke, has lain in the assumption that Cyrenius, being governor of Syria in A. D. 6, and making a census then, was never governor at any other time; and that consequently Luke, in placing him in B. C. 4, had made the enormous error

of at least eight years in a matter of public history. It is to get over or explain away this, that books have been written, and theologians toiled, and scholars, in desperation, done violence to the construction of the original. To us it appears that this difficulty is no longer formidable; for Zumpt has shewn, from sources altogether independent and non-Christian, the high probability at least of that which the Christian historian has been condemned for asserting. That Cyrenius was governor about the time of the birth of Christ, would now, we think, be deemed credible, even if Luke had never named him, and will probably be acquiesced in as the conclusion of a scholar, by those who despise or reject the authority of the evangelist.

B.

JUBILEE OF THE REV. JOHN ANGELL JAMES.

ON Wednesday evening, September 12, the Town Hall of Birmingham was filled to overflowing by a multitude of persons assembled to mark their respect for this venerable Minister of Christ, by the presentation of a testimonial to him on the completion of the fiftieth year of his pastorship of the congregation in Carr's Lane. The body of the Hall was entirely occupied by the congregation themselves; the galleries, also entirely occupied, were set apart for friends admitted by ticket; and the large orchestra, which was used as the platform, was completely filled by ministers and others, and was the place from which the various speakers in succession addressed this vast assembly. The proceedings of the evening commenced with a brief devotional service. A letter was then read from the Rev. J. C. Miller, the rector of St. Martin's, expressing in the strongest terms his high appreciation of Mr. James and cordial sympathy with him, together with his regret that absence from Birmingham prevented him from attending the meeting; and this was followed by a no less earnest speech in the same strain from the Rev. J. B. Marsden, the respected clergyman of St. Peter's church. Addresses were also presented to the Rev. gentleman, accompanied in many instances with very interesting speeches by those who presented them, from Philadelphia, U.S., from Dublin, from various religious societies in London and Birmingham, from the students of Spring-Hill College, and, finally, from the Rev. gentleman's own congregation. The latter, after having been read to the meeting by the Rev. W. Dale, Mr. James's colleague, was placed in Mr. James's hands, with brief but earnest words of grateful acknowledgment by Mr. Joseph Phipson, one of the only two surviving members of the congregation who had invited Mr. James fifty years ago, and the very gentleman by whom that invitation had

been conveyed. Almost all these addresses contained specific notice of the service which Mr. James was considered to have rendered to the cause of Christian truth and righteousness by his numerous publications, especially by that entitled "The Anxious Inquirer," which, it was stated, had been translated into at least a dozen European and Oriental languages, had been welcomed in the palace as well as in the cottage, and had had a circulation of not less than a million copies. The testimonial itself, presented by William Beaumont, Esq., the Chairman of the meeting, consisted of a beautiful silver vase with suitable reliefs, a very costly copy of the Holy Scriptures and of Roberts' Views in the Holy Land in illustration of them, and a sum of more than £500; all the proceeds of a subscription by the Rev. gentleman's admirers and friends. This sum of £500, with some addition from his own private resources, Mr. James generously expressed his intention of applying for the benefit in some permanent way of his brethren in the ministry. In acknowledgment of these earnest tokens of respect and regard, Mr. James read a very interesting and affecting reply, which he had previously prepared, and which he delivered with his characteristic and accustomed impressiveness; and the proceedings soon afterwards terminated with the reply of the Rev. W. Dale, his lately-chosen colleague, to a very elegant and (doubtless) well-merited eulogy of Mr. Dale's talents and character, pronounced by the respected Principal of Spring-Hill College, in which he had recently been a student. The meeting lasted for more than four hours; and in the course of it, four hymns were sung to the accompaniment of the magnificent organ, two of them unmistakably Trinitarian. The crowded assembly exhibited to its close an untiring interest in the proceedings, which were conducted by its very able President with a promptitude, exactness, order and spirit, which were truly exemplary.

It was in the spirit of true and admiring sympathy that the writer of this brief sketch witnessed and shared in the proceedings of this interesting Jubilee. Gratitude for personal kindness recently received from Mr. James himself and many members of his church, under severe domestic affliction, confirmed me in the determination which I should probably otherwise have formed, to participate at least by my presence in doing honour to this zealous and influential and venerable Preacher and Minister of the Gospel of Christ. It is indeed with no ordinary thankfulness that I desire to record the confirmation which my recent experience has afforded me of a conviction which I have always cherished and hope ever to maintain, viz., that *there is such a thing as a common Christianity*. I can never forget that the condolences and sympathy which I have lately received from friends of every religious denomination, Churchmen and Dissenters alike, have been distinctively *Christian* in their character, and offered in a spirit (I gratefully acknowledge) worthy of our

common yet sacred name. I desired by my presence at this Jubilee meeting to shew that I deeply feel and highly value this spontaneous evidence of the kind and generous and eminently *fraternal* influences of our most holy faith; and I the rather record it here, because I no less rejoice in the assurance that mine has been no exceptional case.

And the proceedings at the meeting itself tended not less to encourage also the conviction that a free and fearless, an open and practical avowal of his religious opinions and sentiments, as it is the first duty, so is it the highest interest, of every Christian Minister, and will secure for him, even from those who are without the pale of his own religious denomination, a degree of respect and regard which no other course of conduct can permanently obtain. I unfeignedly rejoice with Mr. James and his congregation in the testimony to this truth which it was my gratification on this occasion both to witness and to render.

It is in no captious spirit, but simply as the record of a fact, that I notice with regret rather than surprise, that there appeared to me a marked exclusion, by some of the speakers, of all but Trinitarian Christians from recognized participation in the sacred service of the one Lord and Master of us all. While ministers of the Established Church of England could fraternize with a minister of the Established Church of Scotland, and these with Dissenters of almost every denomination, in doing honour to the worthy Pastor of the Carr's Lane congregation, most of them did so in connection with the exclusive recognition of what are commonly called *evangelical* or *orthodox* doctrines. There was no clear acknowledgment of that wider Christian fellowship which should subsist, whether with or without ecclesiastical union, among those who, notwithstanding diversities of creed, may be all equally embraced within the apostolic benediction, "Grace be with all them that love our Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity." While feeling that such an acknowledgment as this is incumbent on every one who desires to cherish the spirit of our Great Master, and that no less catholic acknowledgment will suffice, I am so far from being indifferent to what I regard as the errors or dangers of prevalent religious opinions and systems, that I consider that the sincerity of love for the Lord Jesus Christ demands, in union with this widest liberality of religious sentiments, a precision and an earnestness in the avowal and maintenance of our individual religious convictions, such as the Great Witness to the truth himself exemplified even unto death. I could not witness and share in the proceedings of this interesting Jubilee, without reflecting that the town in which it was held had been, less than seventy years ago, the scene of the teachings and labours of the illustrious and venerable Dr. Priestley; a name at present far less regarded than it ought to be, but which will hereafter, and at no distant day, vindicate for

itself the highest honour here, for his eminent services to the cause of religious truth and goodness, as well as for his numerous and valuable scientific discoveries. In no spirit of sectarian bigotry, but simply in remembrance of his life and labours here, I could not but ask myself, while contemplating the evidence before me of the continued prevalence of a religious system which he exerted himself so strenuously to correct,—Is the Unitarian controversy, then, worn out? Have Unitarian Christians no longer any duty to discharge in the avowal and maintenance of their distinctive faith? Nor could I be insensible, in the presence of this vast assembly of the supporters of popular orthodoxy, to the importance of a clear apprehension of some distinct doctrine or principle as the basis and principle of ecclesiastical union, or to the importance of such union itself. Our Trinitarian brethren know very well what are the doctrines and principles for the maintenance of which they co-operate with one another. Why should not Unitarian Christians be equally cognizant of *their* distinctive faith, and equally (though freely) united in the maintenance of it? Yet so unable do many appear to recognize this distinctive faith in its simplicity, that some can find no worthy meaning in the appropriate name by which it is designated, except by an interpretation of it which does violence at once to etymology and to history; while others search laboriously through the works of some of its popular advocates, whom they would thus elevate to the rank of lords of our faith, in order to find out another doctrine which they may substitute for the one simple, intelligible and scriptural doctrine which alone is really designated by this distinctive appellation. Notwithstanding all the fancifulness and all the laboriousness of a critical ingenuity, it will, I think, ever be obvious to most simple-minded and serious investigators, that the word *Unitarianism* is, both etymologically and historically, the correlative of the word *Trinitarianism*; and that as the latter expresses, and was designed to express as a fundamental article of the Christian faith, the belief in God and the worship of Him “in *trinity*”—in “one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost”—so the former expresses, and was designed to express as a fundamental article of the Christian faith, the belief in God and the worship of Him in his absolute and undivided *unity*, in the person of the Father *alone*. Until those who intelligently and sincerely entertain this belief return to the distinct recognition and avowal of it, and earnestly unite in the practical manifestations of its influence which it demands, it would require a miracle to carry forward that work of religious reformation in this connection which the venerable fathers and confessors of Unitarian Christianity, ever since the commencement of what we deem the corruption of Gospel truth, have laboured and suffered and died to promote.

It cannot, I think, be too earnestly reiterated, that Christian charity demands for its exercise and culture, not indistinctness or looseness of thought, but comprehensiveness and kindness of affection. Let our ideas of religion, as of every other kind of truth, be as defined and clear and correct as we can possibly make them, and let us express them accordingly. Our sentiments are the more likely, on that very account, to be enlarged and generous. "An idea" (says Goethe, whom I quote in confirmation of these views, because his name may commend them to the regard of some who would not otherwise notice them at all)—"An *idea* should not be liberal, but firm, energetic, decisive. It is in the *sentiments* that liberality is to be sought." May we learn to combine distinctness and firmness of idea (both individually and in union with others for the required practical applications of the idea) with the most enlarged, the most truly Christian liberality! It is only as we really do this, that we can effectually advance the cause of truth and righteousness among men, and thereby of permanent peace and good-will; but if we do this intelligently and perseveringly, our success, however remote, is sure.

These are some of the counsels and encouragements which naturally suggest themselves to my mind from what I have seen and felt in connection with the very interesting Jubilee of the venerable John Angell James. I have sincere pleasure in appending my own name to this brief record of it in the pages of the Christian Reformer.

SAMUEL BACHE.

PHANTOM-DISPERSERS.

A CERTAIN Queen in some South-sea Island, I have read in missionary books, had been converted to Christianity; did not any longer believe in the old gods. She assembled her people; said to them, "My faithful people, the gods do *not* dwell in that burning mountain in the centre of our Isle. That is not God; no, that is a common burning mountain,—mere culinary fire burning under peculiar circumstances. See, I will walk before you to that burning mountain; will empty my wash-bowl into it, cast my slipper over it, defy it to the uttermost, and stand the consequences!" She walked accordingly, this South-sea heroine, nerved to the sticking-place; her people following in pale horror and expectancy. She did her experiment; and, I am told, they have truer notions of the gods in that Island ever since. Experiment which it is now very easy to *repeat*, and very needless. Honour to the Brave who deliver us from Phantom-dynasties, in South-sea Islands and in North!—*Carlyle's Cromwell*, I. 444.

INTELLIGENCE.

THE FEDERAL-STREET (BOSTON, U.S.)
CHURCH CASE.

We have long wished to place in our pages a memorial of the important suit argued in the Supreme Judicial Court of America at the close of last year, and on which Chief Justice Shaw has in the course of the present year pronounced the judgment of the Court. The publication of the judgment in *extenso* in the pages of the *Boston Daily Advertiser* of Aug. 1, furnishes us with the means, but the great length of the document will compel us, in transferring it to our pages, to use the pruning knife. But first we give a very interesting sketch of the case, said to be from the pen of our countryman, Rev. Mr. Mountford, and inserted in the *Inquirer* :

At Boston, United States, before Chief Justice Shaw and three other judges sitting in the Supreme Judicial Court during five days, beginning on November 22nd, a law suit was argued, being an action by a Presbyterian congregation, brought against the proprietors of the Federal-Street church, for the purpose of ejecting them from the ownership of the edifice. The church in Federal Street is the church of which Dr. Gannett is the clergyman, and of which Dr. Channing was a minister to the end of his life. The plaintiffs in the case are a few persons who, three or four years ago, formed themselves into a Presbyterian congregation, in connection with some one of the many bodies into which Presbyterians are divided and sub-divided.

About the year 1730, a few Scotch settlers in Boston associated themselves together, and formed a congregation. They called themselves Presbyterians, and in one of the records of their early transactions they made mention of the Church of Scotland, by way of illustrating some purpose which they had in view, but which, however, was not of a doctrinal character. About the year 1780, the congregation felt that their attempt at Presbyterianism was inconvenient, and they resolved to govern themselves as Congregationalists. When the great Unitarian controversy arose in New England about the year 1810, the congregation manifested itself as holding in theology Unitarian opinions, and the congrega-

tion then shewed that liberal tendencies in thought had been strengthening in its members, probably unconsciously, and probably, also, from a long time before. It was an old congregation, and, like so many other of the oldest congregations in New England, it avowed itself to be Unitarian.

In New England, most commonly churches are owned by the pewholders, and a man buys, sells and bequeaths a pew, just as he does a house or a piece of land. At the Federal-Street church, there is not a pew, and probably never was, which was not acquired by purchases and through a deed of conveyance. So that when the congregation from having been Presbyterian became Congregationalists, and, at another time, when from having been Trinitarian they shewed themselves Unitarian, it was in a church which was of their own buying or inheriting, and where there was not one inch of land, nor one brick, nor one bit of wood, for which, one by one, the several pewholders had not paid the full value.

The Presbyterian congregation which has lately been formed in Boston is very small indeed, but very orthodox, and also exceedingly covetous of the fine, large and very valuable church, which has been consecrated to so many minds, all the world over, by the ministry of Channing.

When the congregation in Federal Street was Presbyterian, they had a church which was worth in money probably three or four hundred pounds, but the church which they erected after the commencement of the ministry of Dr. Channing is estimated to be worth twenty thousand pounds. This valuable building—this edifice, dear to so many families as having been the resort of their forefathers—this church, towards which from all parts of the world so many souls have turned so gratefully and so reverently for the voice once heard within its walls—this church, where so many of the best citizens of Boston worship, it is attempted to wrest from its present occupants as not being orthodox in the judgment of the Church of Scotland. These orthodox Presbyterians say to Dr. Gannett's congregation, "We claim your church for our own, because of your being Unitarian and Congrega-

tionalist; whereas the first few dollars of your large estate was the property of men who were Trinitarian, and who held and said something about imitating the Church of Scotland in something, though we cannot say what it was, or indeed whether it was really anything at all, beyond what will serve us as a point in law. However, you are Unitarian, and we are Trinitarian, and we want your church."

To this the Federal-Street congregation reply, "Our church was built for Dr. Channing. And as for the land on which it stands, it has come into our possession by purchase and inheritance—by means as just, as moral, and we think also as legal, as can be. Our church is ours; and we hope to hold it, although you fancy that you have found a crevice at which chicanery can force an entrance to dispossess us. Remember the commandment, 'Thou shalt not covet thy neighbour's goods.'"

During the hearing of the suit before the judges, it appeared that much evidence on the case had been previously taken from persons acquainted with the usages of the Scotch Church and with the laws of Scotland, from divines in the State of New York, and from lawyers in Edinburgh and Glasgow.

The case was conducted on behalf of the Presbyterian plaintiffs by Rufus Choate, the Attorney-General of the State of Massachusetts, and by Richard H. Dana, who was once two years before the mast, and who is known in England by the publication of his maritime experiences. On behalf of the Unitarian congregation there appeared Sidney Bartlett, eminent as a lawyer, and George T. Hillard, eminent not in legal scholarship only, but also in the wide field of literature, and who is the author of a work recently published, "Six Months in Italy."

On behalf of the plaintiffs, much was said on the difference between Unitarian and Trinitarian, and about Trinitarians accounting Unitarians no Christians. But declamation of this character was evidently not very much relied on for effect, even by the advocate in whose province it was to make use of it. The plaintiffs seemed to rest the legal force of their case on something in the origin of the church, by which it was asserted that the edifice was placed on a different ground from most other churches. That something is this—that out of all the persons who subscribed for the erection of the building, and in return for their money who had

pews assigned them for their ownership, there was at least one man, John Little, who gave a larger sum of money than the others. But though John Little gave more money than any one else to the erection of the church, yet he had only one pew assigned to him for his property. And therefore it was argued that whatever money he gave to the erection of the church over and above the value of his pew, was an act of charity in him, and was a deed which placed the church for ever under the Act which regulates the administration of charities.

The Presbyterians who lay claim to Dr. Gannett's church, on the pretence that it ought to belong to the Church of Scotland, are themselves, by spiritual descent, aliens to the Scotch Church, and, themselves in Scotland, they would not have legal footing in any Kirk of the Establishment. In America, they ask to be put into possession of a church, by virtue of Scotch laws, which in Scotland itself would not allow them either a voice or existence in any Kirk within their cognizance.

In order in this case to make appear as small as possible the difference between the Presbyterian plaintiffs and the Presbyterians of the Church of Scotland, it was sworn that the clergyman, with whom their secession began in the first half of the last century, did himself never leave the Established Church. And by one of the counsel much stress was laid on his never having left the Church of Scotland; and yet it was made evident that if he never left the Church, at least that the Church left him, for it excommunicated him, and in a state of excommunication he died.

To the Unitarians of England it is a matter of much pleasure and interest to know that, in this suit between these Calvinistic Presbyterians and the congregation of the late Dr. Channing, much use was made of the arguments on the Lady Hewley case, the Wolverhampton Chapel case, and also of the Debates on the Dissenters' Chapels Bill. By Mr. Dana, quotations were made of the opinions of Lord Eldon, and the Vice-Chancellor Shadwell; while by Mr. Hillard these opinions were rebutted by citations from the words of other and better men. And by him also were read with great effect extracts from the speeches of Sir William Follet, Sir Robert Peel, Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Shiel, in the Debates on the Chapels' Bill. And so it appears that, in

their great struggle a few years ago, the Unitarians of England fought in a battle greater than they knew of. For with the consequences of their victory, religious liberty, or at least the arguments for it, were strengthened for the whole world, and even for the use and benefit of republican America.

The conclusion of Mr. Hillard's speech was a noble peroration, and, without purposely attempting pathos, it was yet very touching. Mr. Hillard is himself a worshiper in the Federal-Street church. At the end of his speech in the Court, he said that his clients were good citizens, and would acquiesce without a murmur in even an adverse verdict; and that, if it should be the decree of the Court, they would go forth from the church of their fathers, and in their temper would shew how they had profited by the instruction of their pastors, both the living and the dead. As he said this, he laid his hand on the shoulder of Dr. Gannett, and then as he sat down there was deep emotion among the persons in the Court, and many of them wept.

In giving judgment, Chief Justice Shaw first described the litigating parties and the nature of the suit.

SHAW, C. J.—This case comes before the Court upon a report of one of the judges, in a prosecution instituted in the name of John H. Clifford, Esq., Attorney-General, by and at the relation of the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Synod of New York, and the First Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church and Society of Boston, the pastor of said church and society, and persons named as the Ruling Elders and Prudential Committee, in behalf of themselves and the rest of the members of said church and society, and John W. Emery.

This information sets forth that in May, 1729, one Henry Deering by his deed conveyed to John Little, in fee, in consideration of £550, a parcel of land, bounded and described, situate on the corner of Long Lane and Bury Street, in Boston.

It is conceded that Long Lane corresponds with the street now known as Federal Street, and Bury Street with the present Channing Street, and that the land described in said deed is the same lot on which the respondents, an incorporated religious society, now have and occupy a meeting-house for public worship, and a dwelling-house sometimes used as a parsonage-house.

The information then sets forth that John Little, being minded to devote his property to the founding and supporting of a church and place of religious worship, to be held and enjoyed for ever, for the preaching and maintaining of the doctrine, discipline, worship and form of government of the Church of Scotland, and to create and found a trust and charity therefor, did, on the 9th of June, 1735, make the deed to George Glen and others, to hold to "the only and proper use, benefit and behoof of the said congregation (according to the tenure and after the same manner as the Church of Scotland holds and enjoys the lands whereon the meeting-houses are erected) for ever," as fully set forth in the deed, a copy of which is annexed to the information. That John Little and George Glen and others, being Presbyterians, strongly attached to the Presbyterian Church of Scotland, did severally contribute the land in said deed mentioned, in whole or in part, and the moneys wherewith the said meeting-house was built and the expenses attending the premises were defrayed; and did thereafter by said indenture create and establish the trust and charity. That the trust so created was accepted by Glen and others, and was held by the said grantees in trust. That said deed created a trust for the support of the Christian religion, according to a particular form of worship and discipline, known as Scotch Presbyterian, which trust or charitable estate they had a good right to create, and Glen and others to accept; and that this was done with the express understanding, and no other, that said meeting-house and land were to be held for a Scotch Presbyterian Society.

The information sets out the law of Scotland in 1735, in regard to Presbyterian churches, to the exclusion of all others; it sets out what the faith and discipline of that church was, that it was not Congregational, nor Unitarian, but opposed thereto, and sets out what the standards of that church were; sets out the doctrines of that church; that Little, Glen and others, professed said doctrines and were not Congregationalists nor Unitarians, but Presbyterians; that there is a great difference therein; and that a particular version of the Psalms, and no other, is used by said church; that the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church of North America is in all material matters the same; that said Association was made

in or about 1782, professing the faith of the Church of Scotland, and corresponding identically with said Church as it existed in 1735, in all matters of faith, government and worship, except as altered by the republican nature of our institutions. That said society was under Rev. John Moorhead, and continued to flourish till 1773, as a Scotch Presbyterian Society, when he deceased. That for about ten years they were without a pastor; that in 1783, Rev. Robert Annan, a member of the Presbytery of New York, subordinate to the Associate Reformed Synod of New York, was duly installed, and continued till 1786, when he removed from this Commonwealth. That in 1774, the said society in Long Lane notified their temporary declination from the Presbytery of Boston for a special purpose, not stating what, as by the discipline they had a right to do, which wrought no change in the trust and charity aforesaid, formed with others a synod, afterwards dissolved, and in 1782 became connected with the Presbytery and Synod of New York, with which it has ever since continued to be associated. That this society was connected, at various times, with various Synods and Presbyteries, but that all these changes and memberships with different Synods and Presbyteries, did in no wise alter or in any way affect the relations of said church in Long Lane, in matters of faith, government, worship or discipline, with the Church of Scotland, or the Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church of this country, but were merely changes of convenience or necessity in matters of discipline. That said Robert Annan was called from the Presbytery of New York, of which he was then a member, to the pastoral charge of the society in Long Lane, by their vote and request, and that measures were taken between said society, said Presbytery and said Annan, by which their relation and control was recognized, and the said Annan was duly installed by said Presbytery in 1783, and that in 1786 he was duly removed by his own request; that said Presbytery and Synod of New York have never relinquished their right to control and govern said church, but continue to this day to claim such right; that the society here present as relators, known as the First Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church and Society of Boston, was duly organized by the Presbytery of New York as a

religious society after the Presbyterian order in 1846, as connected with and under the jurisdiction of the Presbytery and Synod of New York, a religious body duly established, having full supervisory power over the church and society here present as relators; that Rev. Alexander Blaikie is minister, and is, and before 1846 was, a member of the Synod of New York, and was duly installed, &c., and has so continued ever since. That this society do profess and teach the same faith, &c., according to the standards of the Church of Scotland, in the year 1735, except as they are modified to conform to the civil government, &c.

The Attorney-General, at the relation, &c., further informs that in 1786 a majority of said congregation, contrary to the intentions of said John Little, and said Little, Glen and others, &c., and contrary to the trust and charity aforesaid, and contrary to right, resolved themselves into a society different from Presbyterian, and from the ministrations of said Moorhead and said Annan, and have ever since continued, with various changes of form of worship, faith, &c., to be a society other than Scottish Presbyterian; that at the time, 1786, a minority of said congregation objected to the said change, and decided to remain under the ancient form of worship, government and belief, &c., but was overborne and obliged to submit to the wrong and injury done by the said majority, &c., by which said trust became perverted, abused and misapplied; that in 1787, Rev. Jeremy Belknap, an orthodox Congregationalist, and not a Presbyterian, was installed, not in Presbyterian form; and that the Presbytery of New York, and the minority of the congregation, did object, and did not consent thereto.

The information then goes on to state, that the society immediately made great changes in the form of worship, the introduction of a new version of psalms and hymns, continued to be an Orthodox and Trinitarian congregation and society till 1815, then again changed and became Unitarian; and by said last-mentioned change, said trust became perverted, abused and misapplied; that the discipline was overthrown; that the doctrines (enumerated) were hostile to those of the Presbyterian; that Unitarianism was not known in 1735 in Scotland, Great Britain, or the Colonies, and could not exist; that the land is not

now held by the same tenure as the Church of Scotland held and enjoyed the lands on which meeting-houses were built in 1735; that John W. Emery, one of the relators, is desirous that the land and church should be given up, and that the occupation be decreed to belong to the First Associate Reformed Presbyterian Church and Society in Boston, here present as relators; that the premises are those formerly known as Dr. Channing's church, now in the occupation of the Unitarian society, under Rev. E. S. Gannett, D.D., which said society was duly incorporated about the year 1805; that possession has been duly demanded and refused. The information alleges that the equity ought not to be regarded as weakened or impaired by lapse of time, for various reasons set forth; alleges that the premises are of great value; prays an account of rents and profits, and asks relief from the court as a court of equity. The interrogating part of the bill, in addition to the general prayer for an answer to the stating part, annexes 116 particulars, in respect to which an answer is sought, but these it will not be necessary to refer to more particularly. The information calls for records, books, papers and documents, and contains a prayer for general relief.

The answer of the respondents is copious and full: a brief statement of the material points alone will be sufficient. They state that they are an incorporated religious society, incorporated by the Legislature by an Act passed June 15, 1806; that they are the true and sole owners of the premises occupied by them and demanded in the bill; and that the Act of Incorporation was passed on the application of persons who prior thereto, as owners of pews, were tenants in common of the land and house; that the charter was accepted; that the society have been ever since in the open and undisputed occupation, expended large sums in improvements and a new building for public worship; and they submit that this open, exclusive possession for nearly fifty years should operate as a confirmation and assurance of their title, if defective, which they deny; and they rely on this, and on the statutes limiting actions by way of bar, as if specially pleaded.

They admit the deed from Deering to Little, the conveyance from Little to Glen and others, but deny that said deed created a charitable estate for the support of the Christian religion

according to the Presbyterian form, or that any charitable use was created thereby, or that it was so accepted by Glen and others, or that it was in any sense a gift or coupled with any immutable condition, or that it was the intention of said Little to restrict the use of said meeting-house to a Presbyterian service and none other, or that he had any right to make such restriction.

They say that prior to 1735, a number of persons associated together to erect a place of public worship for their own use, of whom Little was one; that Little was their agent, to procure land and erect a house; that the cost was defrayed by contributions from the associates, and paid into the hands of Little. They then set out the controversy, the reference to Sheafe and others, the award, the deed made by Little pursuant to the award to Glen and others, assigned to them as a prudential committee, but to the proper use and benefit of the congregation (according to the tenures, &c.) as in the deed, that thereby the legal estate vested in said trustees and the beneficial interest in the pewholders and *cestuis que trust*, that the trustees had no other beneficial interest than as pewholders, and thus the said land and buildings were acquired, owned and held by the associates as their private property, over which they had full dominion and power to change the use to which the same might and should from time to time be appropriated.

They then say, that the associates, trustees and *cestuis que trust*, pewholders, continued to hold the land and buildings as tenants in common; that rights to pews were acquired, by deeds from the prudential committee, who were chosen from time to time, as vacancies occurred, by the pewholders; that they know not the tenures of lands held by churches in Scotland in 1735, but whatever they were, they do not affect this conveyance, because Presbyterianism was, by the law of Scotland, established and exclusive, but in Massachusetts, whilst a colony and province, and since it has become independent, no one form of religion has been established or had preference, &c.; they deny that the said society continued to 1786 to be a Presbyterian society, or to be connected with any Presbytery, but say that during a part of that time were wholly independent, and acted and governed themselves as such; they admit that the Presbyterian

doctrines are opposed to Unitarian, as professed and taught by the respondent society; they speak of John Little, suppose he was a member of the society, but do not know his religious opinions; deny that he established or intended to establish or had any right to establish any trust for the perpetual use of a Presbyterian or any other society; but say that the use created by the deed was a trust for the pewholders, of whatever denomination they should be, though they own their attachment to the Presbyterian mode of government and discipline; and they deny that said Little or any other person did make any charitable gift, or that any public charity whatever was provided for, and therefore this Court has no jurisdiction of the subject as a public charity. Passing over many points, such as the tenures of all lands in Scotland, the nature and character of Presbyterianism in this country, the settlement of Mr. Annan in 1783, his dismissal in 1786, the measures taken to connect themselves with the Presbytery of New York, the nature of that connection or its dissolution, and the establishment of a Presbyterian society in Boston in 1846, under Rev. Mr. Blaikie, its numbers and condition, to most of which they profess their inability to answer, and leave plaintiffs to their proofs, if material; they then say that in August, 1786, the proprietors did, by an unanimous vote of all persons legally or equitably interested in the said land and meeting-house, embrace the Congregational mode of government, and resolve themselves into a church and society different from the Presbyterian, and it has ever since continued so, but how far different from the society of 1785, they do not know. They say they do not know whether any minority of the congregation objected to the change of 1786, but if by "congregation" the relators mean worshippers or distinct from pewholders, no wrong could be done them, because they had no legal rights in the premises; that the control of the meeting-house was in the pewholders, and the change then effected was the unanimous act of the pewholders, and not of a majority of them. They affirm the installation of Dr. Belknap, that he was not a Presbyterian nor installed in Presbyterian forms, that he introduced a new collection of psalms and hymns, that the meeting-house and land ever since the said installation have been owned and occupied by a Congrega-

tional society, that after that date the opinions of pewholders underwent a gradual change, and they became a Unitarian society, but whether in 1815, they cannot say, &c.

In their answer to the amended bill, a few things are added which it may be proper to notice here.

They deny that said Little made the indenture of June, 1735, in consequence of being minded and disposed to devote his property to the founding of a church as Presbyterian. On the contrary, they aver that he was one of numerous associates who undertook to build for their common use and benefit a meeting-house on the land in question, in conducting which he was the common agent of all the associates, until the difficulty occurred, &c.; and that he devoted none of his own property, except his contributory share, for which he was reimbursed by the reservation in said deed of a pew and seat in said meeting-house. They deny that said Little, Glen, Shaw, Hall and Knox, and the other associates, devoted their property to found a Presbyterian church or to create any trust or charity therefor, but say that they and all the other parties, without any intent to found a charity, but simply to erect a meeting-house for their common use, to be held by and for themselves in proportion to the sums by them respectively contributed, and did receive equivalent rights as pewholders; deny that said Little, Glen, Shaw and Knox, had good right to create and establish, or to accept any such trust or charitable estate, on the contrary were bound to execute a good deed to the congregation; do not admit that it was intended by said Little, Glen and others, that said land should be for ever used and enjoyed by a Scottish Presbyterian, Trinitarian society, and none other, &c.

They admit that the respondent society is, and for many years past has been, a Unitarian society; but they deny that such change of faith was a perversion or abuse of the trust asserted to have been created by the said John Little, and by said Little, Glen and others, or that it was contrary to the said deed, and they deny that any trust or charity was created thereby.

They admit that the said John W. Emery is now, and has been for some time past, a pewholder in the church, but do not know whether he is desirous that said meeting-house be given up.

They deny that said meeting-house and land, so conveyed by said John

Little, was intended by Little, Glen and others, for the sole use, &c., in the manner stated in said bill, or that it should be for ever and exclusively enjoyed by a Scottish Presbyterian, Trinitarian society; but they aver that said conveyance was intended by the grantor and grantees, and the other parties interested in the erection of said meeting-house, for their use, enjoyment and disposition, as set forth in this and their former answer.

This cause has been very elaborately and, we may add, ably and ingeniously argued, and the Court have been gratified and greatly aided and enlightened by the argument. Yet we cannot avoid feeling a great anxiety respecting the result, principally on the ground that the questions are to a great extent new in this Commonwealth, and that the decision may deeply affect important rights, not only of these parties, but of others, as a precedent, in matters of vital importance to the best interests of a civil and religious community. Our difficulty does not arise from want of great learning and research, and a citation of numerous cases; our perplexity rather arises from the great abundance of cases which have been decided in Great Britain and in the other States, having analogies more or less direct to the subject; they are numerous, and indicate an amount and scope of legal learning and judicial discrimination which require much time and study to enable us to understand all their bearings. But considering to what an extent the ecclesiastical institutions of Massachusetts have been modified by law and long-established usage, we fear that we cannot, in a case like this, adopt the judicial decisions of England and other States, or the reasons and principles on which they are founded, with the confidence with which we are glad to repose on them in most other cases controverted in our courts.

The great subject of inquiry is, what were the purposes and intentions of those persons who founded and provided a place for public worship in Long Lane in 1730-35; what were their acts and doings; how were such acts effected by the law of the land as it then stood; and what were the relative rights and duties of the grantees named, of the other members of the body associated to provide a place of public worship, and of other persons, in the lot of land then conveyed as the site of a meeting-house.

(To be concluded in the next No.)

MONTHLY SERVICES AT CLEATOR.

In the report of the Provincial Assembly recently held at Liverpool, we inadvertently neglected to mention that Mr. Ainsworth personally renewed his application for provision for the services at Cleator for the next twelve months. He assured the meeting that he felt much indebted to the ministers who had during the last year officiated at Cleator, at much trouble and inconvenience to themselves. That inconvenience he feared had been greatly increased by the removal of Manchester New College to London. A committee was, as usual, appointed to arrange the services, and the following is the list of preachers and subjects.

1855, July 29, Rev. Jas. Martineau, Liverpool—Morning and Afternoon.

Aug. 26, Rev. Charles Beard, B.A., Hyde—Morning: Treasure in Earthen Vessels (2 Cor. iv. 7). Afternoon: The Unity of the Church Universal (1 Cor. xii. 13).

Sept. 30, Rev. J. Ashton, Preston—Morning: The Moral Sentiments appealed to and sanctioned by Christianity (Philipp. iv. 8). Afternoon: The Perfection which Christianity teaches (Philipp. iii. 15).

Oct. 28, Rev. Franklin Baker, A.M., Bolton—Morning: Faith and Works (Titus iii. 8). Afternoon: The way in which Christ saves us (Matt. i. 21).

Nov. 25, Rev. John Wright, B.A., Bury—Morning: The peculiar Characteristics of the True Christian (Matt. v. 17). Afternoon: Christ's Rebuke to Human Fears (Mark vi. 50).

Dec. 30, Rev. C. W. Robberds, Oldham—Morning: Christ the Disperser of Spiritual Darkness (Isaiah ix. 2)—Sacrament.—Afternoon: We spend our years as a tale that is told (Ps. xc. 9).

1856, Jan. 27, Rev. Russell L. Carpenter, B.A., Birkenhead—Morning: The Lamb of God (John i. 29). Afternoon: Saving the Lost (Matthew xviii. 11).

Feb. 24, Rev. T. E. Poynting, Monton—Morning: Faith in Christ contains within itself all that is needful to support our Religious Life here, and lead us to Heaven hereafter (Gal. ii. 20). Afternoon: For it pleased the Father that in Him should all fulness dwell (Col. i. 19).

March 30, Rev. John Robberds, Liverpool—Morning: The voice of God in the Conscience and the Heart (Deut. xxx. 14). Afternoon: The Spirit of Christ contrasted with the Spirit of the World (Matt. v. 38, 39).

April 27, Rev. R. B. Aspland, A.M., Dukinfield—Morning: Illustrations of the Paternal Character of God (Luke xi. 11—13). Afternoon: Faith the Principle of the Christian Life (2 Cor. v. 7).

May 25, Rev. James Bayley, Stockport—Morning: The New Creation (Col. i. 16). Afternoon: The Prophet's Prayer (1 Kings xix. 4).

June 29, Rev. Wm. Gaskell, A.M., Manchester—Morning: Despire not the day of small things (Zech. iv. 10). Afternoon: The Ignorance of the Child exchanged for the Virtues of the Man (1 Cor. xiii. 11).

BRITISH AND FOREIGN SCHOOL SOCIETY.

The continued violation of the catholic principle on which this Society was established, and the apparent hopelessness of any attempt to shame Mr. Dunn and his colleagues who administer its affairs into a better course, have awakened in the minds of many Unitarians in different parts of the kingdom an earnest desire to meet and consider what steps ought to be taken to abate the evil and retrieve the Society.

Our advertising page will, we hope and expect, contain the announcement of an intended meeting, at which Mr. Mark Philips has consented to preside, and which will be attended by Rev. George Armstrong, who has for some years devoted much time and trouble to this subject, and has through the press and at public meetings exposed in an unanswerable manner the unjustifiable perversion of a liberal and catholic trust to the purposes of a so-called "orthodox and evangelical" creed. There are interests at stake not less important than right views of doctrine, viz., fidelity and honour in carrying out a public trust. Mr. Dunn may, in his zeal for the doctrines of the Trinity and the Atonement, think any means justifiable by which he may thwart and obstruct those friends of the British and Foreign School Society who desire its original principles to be respected. But we are mistaken if the public, on hearing the whole case, do not strongly censure his proceedings in this matter. As one of the public, Lord Brougham has in his place in Parlia-

ment expressed surprise and regret at the violation of the Society's constitution, by the systematic introduction of doctrinal teaching into the schools, which cease in consequence to be schools for *all* denominations. If, in spite of private persuasions and public remonstrance, the managers of the Society will persist in their present course, there remains one remedy—an appeal to the Court of Chancery. Most reluctant will every friend of the Society be to invoke the power of the law. The forthcoming meeting will, we hope, devise some remedy for the evil less costly and painful than a Chancery suit; but it is impossible to allow the abuse complained of to continue.

SPECIMEN OF "EVANGELICAL" POETRY AND THEOLOGY.

The *Christian Cabinet*, a cheap paper in the interest of the "Evangelical" party, has just put forth some lines on "the Sunday Music in Kensington Gardens." In calling our attention to the lines, an intelligent Unitarian friend remarks, "We who are blessed with a rational faith should value it more if we were brought into closer contact with that which generally prevails."

Whence this grand, harmonic swell?
Comes it or from heav'n or hell?
'Tis with foul inflations crammed
From the regions of the damned!
For its quivering accents say,
"Trample on the Sabbath-day!"

Such the notes that lured our world,
When the fiends from heav'n were hurl'd;
Such the notes that now, depraved,
Tremble lest a soul be saved!
England, wake! ere God shall swear,
"In wrath I raze thy house of prayer!"

Our correspondent further remarks: "Such the notes," &c. This is giving to military-band music—whether originating in heaven or in hell—a somewhat earlier origin than most folks imagined it could claim! But the knowledge of some persons is truly wonderful. It is not many months since I heard, from the pulpit of a large metropolitan church, a young divine gravely telling his audience how much more precious to the Devil is one good soul than a hundred bad ones!"

OBITUARY.

July 16, at Oldham, aged 49 years, Mr. BENJAMIN HOWORTH, brother of Rev. Franklin Howorth, of Bury.

August 4, at the house of the Rev. Timothy Davis, Evesham, after an illness of three months, borne with great placidity and an entire resignation to the Divine will, HANNAH MATHEWS, aged 62. She had been a faithful and attached servant in the family of Mr. Davis for forty years.

Aug. 9, at Altringham, Mrs. NAYLOR, widow of the late Benjamin Naylor, Esq., of that place, and formerly of Sheffield.

Aug. 24, at the house of his brother, Henry Smith, Esq., Edgbaston, Mr. ROBERT SMITH, second son of the late Timothy Smith, Esq., of Birmingham.

Aug. 25, at Bridport, Dorset, Mr. JOHN COZENS BROWN, aged 67 years.

Aug. 27, at Woodbridge, Suffolk, Mr. THOMAS TEMPLE SILVER, aged 77 years.

Sept. 1, at Mansfield, of consumption, HARRIET, the wife of Mr. Wm. LOWE, aged 45 years.

September 4, at Northiam, Sussex, in the 89th year of his age, the Rev. STEPHEN BLUNDELL. He was an earnest preacher of the gospel of Christ amongst the Unitarian General Baptists for about fifty years. Few men have exceeded him in his endeavours to improve the moral and spiritual condition of those amongst whom he laboured. He was not confined to place or time in his earnest labours; for he visited several Unitarian Baptist churches in this district, and brought many to see the way of salvation. He was a native of Battle, where he began

his public ministry. He was (conjointly with the late Mr. Ashby) successor to the late Rev. W. Vidler. His companion and he, being good walkers, often visited Northiam and Rolvenden the same day, preaching at both places. They took Christ for their example, and delighted in doing good. Mr. Ashby left England for America in the year 1805; he died three or four years ago, at the advanced age of 90. Mr. B. still continued his services at Cranbrook, Rolvenden and Northiam. In 1810, when the chapel at Northiam was rebuilt, he took a wide tour amongst the General Baptist and Unitarian churches, and succeeded in raising a very considerable sum towards paying for the chapel, and by his advice the congregation cleared off the remaining debt, and the chapel is now wholly free.

Mr. Blundell was a very remarkable man for his habits of industry and method in his business, which was that of a shoemaker. His industry secured for him a humble but sufficient independence, which he enjoyed for many years. He gradually sunk from increasing weakness from his advanced age, and without disease he fell a victim to the great conqueror, Death. He had long been perfectly resigned either to life or death, without fear and with good hope of the reward of the blessed. It may be well said of him, "Servant of God, well done!" He has left a widow to deplore his loss.

Sept. 4, at Newton, near Hyde, Cheshire, aged 47, Mr. BENJAMIN MARLER.

Sept. 8, at Ditchingham, Norfolk, MARY, youngest daughter of Mr. E. TIBNAM, late of Farnham, Suffolk.

Sept. 9, after a short illness, CHARLOTTE GAINE, youngest daughter of the late Mr. E. NEEDHAM, of Birmingham.

MARRIAGES.

July 7, at the Hope-Street church, Liverpool, by Rev. Francis Bishop, Mr. GEORGE MARSHALL, formerly a slave in Tennessee, to ELIZABETH, widow of the late Mr. Richard SERPELL, of Melbourne, Australia.

July 29, at the High-Street chapel, Warwick, by Rev. Daniel D. Jeremy, M.A., Mr. SAMUEL BUFFERY, Jun., to Miss MARY GRIGG, both of Warwick.

July 31, at the Old chapel, Mansfield, by Rev. J. G. Teggins, Mr. WILLIAM FRANKS, of New Lenton, to MARY, eldest daughter of Mr. VALLANCE, surveyor and builder, Mansfield.

Aug. 8, at the Unitarian chapel, Moor Lane, Bolton, by Rev. Franklin Baker, M.A., Mr. JOSEPH ALLEN to ESTHER DERBYSHIRE, daughter of Mr. NOAH BROWNLOW.